

FBIS

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 109

7 June 1982

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Comparison: PRAVDA on U.S. Disarmament Proposals	AA 1
Clark Speech Contrasts With Reagan Proposals [Zorin]	AA 1
Reagan Talks Proposals 'Psychological Camouflage'	AA 2
[Kondrashev]	
U.S. Media's Skepticism	AA 3
U.S. Arms Talks Intentions Questioned in PRAVDA	AA 3
[Yakhontov, 6 Jun]	
Pentagon Official Distorts Soviet Arms Policy	AA 4
[L. Ponomarev]	
Reagan's Arms Reduction Plan One-Sided [Bogachev]	AA 5
APN's Semeyko on Opening of Geneva START Talks	AA 6
[Paris LE MATIN 2 Jun]	
IZVESTIYA Compares U.S., USSR on Arms Control	AA 6
[Kondrashov, 28 May]	
Second UN Special Session on Disarmament Opens	AA 10
Gromyko Departure From Moscow	AA 10
Vasilets, Menkes Preview	AA 10
Parliamentary Group's Message	AA 11
Supreme Soviet Presidium Ratifies Weapons Limit	AA 12
Specifications of Trident Missile System Viewed	AA 13
[Semenov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 May]	

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

International Observers Roundtable Program	CC 1
[Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]	
Disarmament Talks	CC 1
CSSR's Husak Visit	CC 4
Versailles Summit Meeting	CC 4
Nonaligned Meeting Ends; Documents Adopted	CC 7

FALKLAND ISLANDS CRISIS

Dispute Benefits British Arms Manufacturers	DD 1
[Skosyrev in IZVESTIYA 30 May]	
Moscow Denies USSR Taking Advantage of Conflict	DD 2
[Lapskiy]	
Canadian, Chilean Aid to British Cited	DD 3
U.S. Stance on S. Atlantic Conflict Cited	DD 3
True Intentions Revealed [Korotkov]	DD 3
'Double-Dealing Nature' [Morev]	DD 4
Pustov Examines 'War in the South Atlantic'	DD 5
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 May]	

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Arms Sales Serve U.S. 'Imperial Ambition'	A	1
[Muravyov]		
U.S. Not Willing To Renew Agreements With USSR	A	1

SOUTH ASIA

RPP on Pakistani Activity in Border Area	D	1
Indian Minister Praises Oil Protocol With USSR	D	1
Paper Carries Photo of Troops in Afghanistan	D	2
USSR, DRA Sign Cultural, Scientific Accord	D	2

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

U.S., PRC Aggravate Tensions in Southeast Asia	E	1
U.S. Promotes Military Buildup in Southeast Asia	E	1
[Vladimirov]		
USSR, SRV Officials Consult on UNGA Session	E	2
[IZVESTIYA 29 May]		

EASTERN EUROPE

Husak Official Visit Concludes 4 Jun	F	1
Soviet-Czechoslovak Communique	F	1
Rusakov Sees Off Delegation	F	6
Telegram From Airplane	F	6
Biographical Report on Husak	F	6
[PRAVDA 1 Jun]		
Jaruzelski Cables Brezhnev From Plane	F	7
TASS Reports Polish-Romanian Joint Communique	F	7

WESTERN EUROPE

Reaction to Versailles Economic Summit	G	1
Summit Conclusion Reported	G	1
Sturua Commentary	G	1
[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]		
PRAVDA on U.S. Aims [6 Jun]	G	1
Bovin on Trade Ties	G	2
Vorontsov Article on U.S.-W. European Relations	G	3
[PRAVDA 31 May]		
Preview of Reagan's West Berlin Visit	G	5
[Ostrogorskiy, 3 Jun]		
Kostandov, FRG Economics Minister Hold Talks	G	6
Evaluation of Visit of Austrian President	G	6
Foreign Press Reaction	G	6
Kirchschlaeger Assessment	G	8
[PRAVDA 31 May]		
Sobolev on Sweden's Hounding 'Innocent Spy'	G	8
[Sovetskaya ROSSIYA 27 May]		

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Israel's 'Fifth War' Against Arabs Condemned [Kisilev]	H	1
Reportage on Israeli Invasion of Lebanon	H	2
Israelis Advance Into Lebanon	H	2
PLO Communique Cited	H	3
Israeli Offensive Repelled	H	3
Israeli, Syrian Troops Clash	H	3
Soviet UN Envoy's Comment	H	3
Ponomarev Receives Iraq's Tariq 'Aziz	H	4
INA Report	H	4
Iraq-Soviet Friendship Society Meets in Moscow [INA]	H	4
Arkhipov, Syria's Al-Asad Meet in Damascus	H	4
[PRAVDA 28 May]		
Moscow Views Iran-Iraq Armed Conflict	H	5
Bovin Commentary	H	5
Dispute 'Meaningless'	H	6
Economic Cooperation With Iran Examined	H	6
'Long-Term Agreements' [Ivanenko]	H	6
Isfahan Steel Mill	H	7
Late Report: TASS Statement on Israeli 'Aggression'	H	8

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Report on Visit of Angolan Delegation	J	1
[IZVESTIYA, 26 May]		
PRAVDA: S. Africa Steps Up Aggression in Angola	J	2
[Volkov, 7 Jun]		

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Moscow Notes Attempts to Relieve Chile's Woes	K	1
Civil Disobedience Manuel	K	1
New Leftist Bloc	K	1
S. Americans' Refusal on U.S. Maneuvers Noted	K	2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Kiselev, Romanov Discuss Agriculture at Plenums	R	1
Shevardnadze Attends Georgian Meeting	R	1
PRAVDA on Georgian Party Commission's Work [31 May]	R	1
Shcherbitskiy Appears in TV Film on Kiev	R	1
Tikhonov at Farm Machine Exhibition	R	3
Solomentsev Presents Award to Scientists	R	3
Educational Official on Language Teaching	R	4

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

4-6 Jun Agricultural Developments Reported	T	1
--	---	---

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmos-1375 Earth Satellite Launched 6 Jun	U	1
Progress-13 Undocks From Orbital Complex	U	1

COMPARISON: PRAVDA ON U.S. DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 4 June carries on page 4 an editorial article under the headline: "What Is Hidden Behind the U.S. 'Readiness' for Nuclear Arms Reduction." Comparison with the Moscow TASS in English item carrying the same headline, published in the 4 Jun Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page AA 1, reveals that PRAVDA uses quotemarks in some passages, as follows:

Page AA 1, paragraph four, lines three and four: ...The President promised to conduct the talks with "all seriousness and conscientiousness"....

Same paragraph, last sentence: ...will pave the way for "even more far-reaching measures in the future."

Page AA 2, paragraph two, line four: ...with some very vague "setting of limits on other components of the strategic nuclear forces." As to the....

Page AA 3, paragraph three, last line: ...portrayed as a "sensible military balance."

Same page, paragraph five, line two: ...special "destabilizing properties." Assertions of....

Same page, penultimate paragraph, last sentence: Defense Secretary Weinberger said in Congress that "guided-missile submarines armed with Trident-2 SLBM [sea-launched ballistic missiles] will be able to hit various targets that possess a high degree of survivability and are well protected."

Same page, last paragraph; lines three and four: ...the "extremely high accuracy of the cruise missiles makes it possible to use them for destroying the most well protected targets in Soviet Territory."

Page AA 4, second paragraph, lines two and three: ...declares that he is moved by the desire "to achieve a genuine and long-term limitation of the Soviet military programmes."

CLARK SPEECH CONTRASTS WITH REAGAN PROPOSALS

LD061006 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 5 Jun 82

["Moscow Viewpoint" program prepared by Valentin Zorin, "political observer of Soviet radio and television"]

[Text] Recently the American administration officials have gone on record as saying that they are prepared to have constructive talks with the Soviet side in order to try and find a mutually acceptable formula on the problem of nuclear arms limitation and reduction. But only a few days ago a senior administration official made a public statement that was in striking contrast to what was said previously. This official is often described in Washington as the President's second (?son). He is the national security adviser, William Clark, and he spoke at the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University. He said that the United States should rely in its policy on military force. He said the strategy should be to use the armed forces in order to achieve concrete political objectives. This should be done quickly and on the terms favorable for the United States.

This and other public pronouncements by William Clark, including his program statement on foreign policy are, as I said, in striking contrast to the proposals formulated by the President in his speech in Eureka and with the latest statements by Secretary of State Haig. But perhaps William Clark has exceeded his mandate and has spoken without the President's consent and expressed his own personal views. This interpretation, however, hardly applies, especially if one considers the fact that William Clark is one of the men closest to the President and that his post simply rules out the chance of his being ill-informed about the political concepts of the administration.

So, in all probability his speech at Georgetown University had been okayed by his superiors. According to well-informed political analysts, all he really did during his speech was outline the main points of a memorandum on national security which was prepared in the White House recently and which bears the signature of the President himself. The information available about this document indicates that it sets out all the main foreign policy priorities of the United States on a long-term basis and it has been conceived in general as a long-term foreign policy program of the Republican administration. But if this is so, how can the main principles of that program outlined by the national security adviser in his speech be reconciled with what I would call a campaign of smiles launched by Washington officials recently?

The ways of solving the problem of strategic arms limitation and reduction proposed by the American President in Eureka have run, as we all know, into some well-justified criticism not only in Moscow but among some prominent American statesmen and political figures. It is easy to see that these proposals are aimed at securing unilateral advantages for the American side and ensuring its military superiority over the Soviet Union instead of the current strategic parity.

But at the same time the Soviets and the international public welcome the fact that after an 18-month delay both the U.S. President and his secretary of state have found it necessary to come out for Soviet-American talks on these vital issues. This has been welcomed as a step in the right direction and it goes without saying that an indispensable condition for the success of any such talks must be mutual trust. The negotiating parties must know that the other side is not simply trying to score fresh propaganda points or trying to mislead the public on some issues but is genuinely seeking mutually acceptable solutions of difficult problems.

All recent statements by Soviet leaders, including President Leonid Brezhnev himself, indicate the good will and readiness of the Soviet side to conduct such honest talks. As for the American stand on disarmament, it is clearly ambiguous, to say the least. It is really difficult to understand when the United States leaders are sincere when they wave the olive branch or when they speak the language of the cold war. Does Washington really want to seek ways of preventing a nuclear disaster or are the administration officials merely trying to mislead the public at home and abroad using propaganda tricks in a bid to suppress the mounting antiwar campaign in the United States?

REAGAN TALKS PROPOSALS 'PSYCHOLOGICAL CAMOUFLAGE'

LD052052 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jun 82

[From the Vremya newscast; commentary by IZVESTIYA political observer Stanislav Kondrashev]

[Text] In one of his recent speeches, U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig, while not forgetting politics, suddenly talked about psychology. He said success in politics can be achieved only after successes in psychology, the science of perception. Truly, you will achieve little success in politics before you learn to understand people, their behavior and their moods. And in international life you will not travel far if you, so to speak, step on the toes of your near and faraway neighbors and do not take note of their legitimate interests. Live and let live is a simple expression of the formula of peaceful coexistence, and it is also the psychology in interstate relations.

After winning the elections in the fall of 1980, Ronald Reagan was sure that he understood Americans and that they supported his bellicose policy. But now more and more Americans refuse to understand their President; they think he is leading them to where no one wants to go -- the nuclear abyss. And that is where the need for psychology arises. From the White House, as if from a cornucopia, assurances of love of peace began to pour.

The President and his minister swear they are misunderstood. Now they are swearing twice and three times over, as, for the first time, the President has gone to Western Europe where, as is well known, he and his policy are understood even less.

As for relations with the Soviet Union, the U.S. President has taken a liking for the following phrase lately: We must not talk about each other, but to each other. That means we must not abuse each other but come to an understanding. That is fine! It is fine when these simple truths are assimilated by it in the second year of a 4-year education course, or in the realities of international life. Of course, I am talking about the President's 4-year term in the White House.

I have one question: Why do they resort to this psychology now? Is it to correct a wrong and dangerous policy or in order to retain this policy and to confuse the masses of people who are alarmed and waiting for good news? The U.S. President, as a benefactor of humanity, announced that he is now ready to hold talks on the reduction of strategic weapons and forgot to mention that the Soviet Union has insisted on the resumption of these talks for the past 1.5 years, and even before that. But this is not the main point. He is offering a framework for the talks which is deliberately more advantageous for the U.S. than for the Soviet Union.

What is it? Is it really a desire for a reduction of weapons or just psychological camouflage? I fear it is camouflage. And this is why, simultaneously with the talks, the Reagan administration intends to implement plans to increase its strategic nuclear forces. That is known, and they see no need to conceal it. This has been stressed very strongly in the new President's directive expounding the U.S. military strategy. It has been leaked to the press and much is being written about it. The directive speaks about preparations for a prolonged nuclear war. An endless arms race in space is also being planned.

According to American observer Tom Wicker, this directive on U.S.-Soviet relations promises an intense war to the death. So, have they learned in Washington to understand their own and other people? It does not seem very likely.

U.S. Media's Skepticism

LD011944 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 82

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Official Washington would like to stifle the protests against the White House's militaristic policy, and to this end it dresses up as a peacemaker. In this connection observers are drawing attention to the speech President Reagan made yesterday in Washington in which he announced the agreement between the USSR and the United States to begin official talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. While not refraining from the standard anti-Soviet attacks in his speech, the President declared the United States' readiness to open the way to peace. This statement was greeted skeptically by the American press. The New York TIMES says that Reagan's speech is aimed at curbing the growth of the campaign for a freeze on nuclear arsenals. The Washington POST saw an obvious attempt in this speech to defuse the powerful antiwar movement in Western Europe and the similar protests which are gathering momentum in the United States.

U.S. ARMS TALKS INTENTIONS QUESTIONED IN PRAVDA

LD060704 Moscow TASS in English 0633 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun, TASS -- "The announcement that the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to start official negotiations in Geneva on June 29 on limiting and reducing strategic arms and that the two sides attach much importance to the negotiations has been regarded with satisfaction in the world," Yuliy Yakhontov writes today in PRAVDA's international review.

Now that agreement on the start of negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic arms has been reached, one would like to believe that the Soviet Union's constructive approach to this important task will impel the U.S. administration to take the path of political realism and with a greater responsibility approach the problem of nuclear disarmament in the strategic field, the author writes.

However, indications coming from across the ocean put one on one's guard. Thus, the Washington POST carried Mr Denton's article which says, in particular, that to Reagan, whose administration has always laid emphasis on a massive build-up of armaments, the announcement of arms reduction talks and of his intention to adhere to the limitations set by the SALT II treaty was an obvious attempt to defuse the vigorous anti-war movement in Europe and the USA.

The editorial headlined "What Is Behind the U.S. 'Readiness' for Nuclear Arms Reduction", which was published in PRAVDA recently and which has met with a wide positive response abroad, contains convincing facts which confirm Washington's aggressive intentions, the review goes on. These facts at the same time expose its endeavours to secure military-strategic advantages for the USA, cancelling the parity-and-equal-security principle which has fully justified itself.

For those who thoughtlessly prepare to plunge the world into a nuclear catastrophe, it should be recalled that "it would be impossible to rectify the results of a nuclear war. One would no longer manage to reconsider errors". This timely warning belongs to Egon Bahr, a prominent West German figure, deputy of the Bundestag, and expert on defence matters.

"In a word, time will show whether the U.S. side intends to participate in the negotiations in earnest with a view to reaching accord or its consent to a new dialogue in Geneva is in actual fact only a tactical move," the author if the review concludes.

PENTAGON OFFICIAL DISTORTS SOVIET ARMS POLICY

LD311520 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 31 May 82

[By TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev]

[Text] Moscow, 31 May, TASS -- Under the pressure of the mounting movement of the U.S. public for the freezing of nuclear potentials and reduction of strategic armaments, representatives of the Washington administration resort to new gimmicks and try to present matters in such a way as if it is the Soviet Union and not the United States that is guided by the concept of the possibility of winning a nuclear war. It is precisely with such assertions, ignoring facts and distorting the peaceful foreign policy of the USSR, that the U.S. Deputy Defence Secretary Fred Ikle came up in a Sunday interview to the ASSOCIATED PRESS.

The Pentagon's official representative resorted to such allegations to justify the United States' further build-up of nuclear armaments and its striving for military supremacy.

It is precisely the United States, and not the Soviet Union that openly proclaims and works out plans of conducting a "limited war" in Europe. It is Washington and not Moscow that threatens to stage a demonstration and deterrence nuclear explosion on European land. These and other "versions" are contained in the U.S. plans of waging nuclear war and this is openly said by official representatives of the present U.S. administration. Thus, according to Presidential Assistant for National Security Affairs Clark concrete political objectives and of doing this promptly and on terms favourable for the United States and its allies.

The Soviet Union's attitude to nuclear war is expressed clearly and definitely: to try to defeat each other in the arms race, to hope to win a nuclear war is a dangerous insanity, Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress.

The Soviet leadership has no other strategy.

REAGAN'S ARMS REDUCTION PLAN ONE-SIDED

LD041458 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 4 Jun 82

[By TASS analyst on military affairs Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun, TASS -- President Reagan's proposal on a phased reduction of the strategic armaments of the USSR and the USA has confirmed the most pessimistic assessments of Washington's position regarding attaining an agreement with the Soviet Union.

The "simple and comprehensive plan of the United States," which U.S. propagandists began to tout long before the President's speech in Eureka College, actually aims at safeguarding a U.S. military superiority.

In the conditions of the present rough parity of the strategic forces of the USSR and the USA, there also exists an asymmetry: namely, that the United States leads in some capacity indicators, while the Soviet Union in others. For instance, the basis of the strategic forces of the Soviet Union is represented by ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (about 70 per cent of all the warheads). On the other hand, the strategic bombers and the submarine-based ballistic missiles of the USA carry over 80 percent of the warheads, i.e. several times more than the respective components of the Soviet strategic force.

Reagan's plan provides for a significant reduction "as soon as possible" of those armaments which constitute the strong point of the Soviet Union, leaving practically intact the powerful strategic systems of the United States.

Under the Reagan plan, for instance, at the first stage there must not be any reductions of the strategic bombers. As follows from the data supplied by the American side at the SALT-2 negotiations, the United States possesses a bomber fleet of 570 aircraft that carry about two thirds of all the nuclear megatonnage of the U.S. strategic force. In the near future, U.S. heavy bombers are to be equipped with big-range (up to 2,600 km) cruise missiles that can be launched to hit assigned targets before the aircraft's entry into the air-defence area of the other side. Reagan's plan provides for no restrictions on the deployment of these cruise missiles.

Under the U.S. President's proposal, the first-stage reductions are to affect only missile warheads and missiles, allowing the sides, as a result, possession of only a half of the agreed quantity of warheads on ground-based missiles.

Suffice it to say that the Reagan plan, if implemented, would leave the strategic nuclear potential of the Soviet Union (as regards the number of charges) at a level of only one-third of the American one.

Reagan proposes to hold negotiations on all the rest of the components of the strategic forces of the two countries only at a second stage.

It cannot be ruled out that Washington stakes on achieving a superiority over the Soviet Union by reducing at the first stage the Soviet Union's main component of the strategic might -- the ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles with warheads on them -- and then torpedoing realisation of the second stage of the negotiations under way, even absurd pretext, as has already been the case with ratifying the SALT treaty.

Effectively, what is offered to the Soviet Union is unilateral disarmament. And this is expected to be done in conditions in which the United States will get the right to go unobstructed about implementing a rearmament programme most comprehensive in U.S. history.

It is quite evident that the U.S. proposals have a lopsided character. It appears that Washington still rejects the principle of equality and equal security of the sides, and strives after an unequal reduction of the now equal strategic forces of the two countries, that is to say after seriously upsetting the present parity.

APN'S SEMEYKO ON OPENING OF GENEVA START TALKS

PM071023 Paris LE MATIN in French 2 Jun 82 p 26

[APN correspondent Lev Semeyko article: "Overarmament Does Not Guarantee Security"; first paragraph LE MATIN introduction]

[Text] On 29 June Washington and Moscow will open their START negotiations on strategic arms limitation in Geneva. Would the West's security be strengthened by the deployment of new U.S. Euromissiles? Soviet specialist Lev Semeyko believes that the levels of the opposing nuclear stockpiles in Europe would rise, which in his opinion is worrying.

Let us suppose the USSR does not respond to the (150-percent) increase in the number of NATO's Eurostrategic nuclear weapons. That would alter the balance of nuclear forces in favor of the United States and NATO -- not only in Europe, but worldwide. How would the United States behave under such conditions? To ask the question is to answer it.

The USSR has frequently stated that it would be forced to take additional defensive measures if NATO deployed new medium-range U.S. missiles in Europe. This would be to restore the balance, as it now exists, but at a higher level.

What, then, would be the U.S. and NATO reaction? We would probably see the appearance of more missiles in Europe. The USSR would respond. Would there then be an unending series of thrusts to the arms race? The absurdity of such a spiral is enough to confuse any sane person.

When he put forward his "zero option," Reagan was well aware that this proposal was unacceptable to the USSR, because its essence is the dismantling of Soviet medium-range missiles in exchange for the promise not to deploy new U.S. missiles in Western Europe. This proposal failed to mention the existence of U.S. forward-based systems in Europe, against which the Soviet missiles are aligned.

Clearly the West would like to be rid of the Soviet missiles targeted westward by a single stroke of the pen. The USSR would like the same to apply to the NATO missiles targeted eastward. A basis for agreement therefore exists. But only on condition that there is an end to demands that the Soviet Union disarm unilaterally.

The USSR is not opposed to examining with the West the issue of medium-range missiles in Europe. But the balance of forces must be kept intact while this analysis takes place and while agreements are sought; and this is why Moscow proposes a moratorium. Such a moratorium implies a quantitative freeze on armaments, both Western and Soviet. The USSR has announced a unilateral moratorium. This is a positive new element in the Soviet position, but the advocates of "overarmament" are doing their utmost to limit its effect.

Overarmament would threaten the security of both West and East. Each new argument in favor of overarmament really helps to prepare for a global disaster. The danger is the greater inasmuch as these arguments are put forward by top-level leaders. This is what has been realized by millions of ordinary people who protest against war. Their voice -- the voice of reason -- must be heeded.

IZVESTIYA COMPARES U.S., USSR ON ARMS CONTROL

PM041507 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by political observer S. Kondrashov: "Washington's Position: In the Mirror of Reality"]

[Text] Recently Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau, addressing a U.S. audience (graduate students at Notre Dame University, Indiana) said: "As allies we must not only support your leadership but be concerned to ensure that in your actions you consider the legitimate goals of other countries belonging to the alliance."

"Our duty as friends is to hold up to you a mirror in which you can see your reflection." In performing this duty Trudeau has decided to "hold up for a while" this mirror to his audience and told them that "the mood for confrontation" between East and West displayed by the Reagan administration "has caused unprecedented concern."

Well, that discovery is nothing new. Back last fall unprecedented concern swept Western Europe, expressed in marches by hundreds of thousands of opponents of nuclear war and the arms race, while this spring it made itself felt with unexpected force and breadth in the United States where many millions of people expressed in one form or another their agreement with the activists of the antinuclear movement. Both the NATO allies and the Americans themselves, including most eminent politicians and authoritative military strategists, are holding up to the Washington leadership numerous mirrors which have essentially reflected the same thing: people who are dragging America and the whole world toward the nuclear abyss, uttering frightening words about the possibility of a "limited" nuclear war, "preventive" nuclear detonations and so forth.

These mirrors have reflected a major moral and political blunder on the part of the present administration. More than any of its predecessors it has frightened the world with the "Soviet threat" -- and by its policy has itself become the world's premier bogey. There was an urgent need to somehow ennoble the image reflected in the mirrors, because with such a terrible countenance, that of the herald of nuclear war, it is impossible to count on a political future or on the support of friends or fellow countrymen.

We know what Washington has done. After 10 months' procrastination they sat down in Geneva at the conference table to talk about nuclear limitation in Europe. After 16 months of procrastination the U.S. President has finally announced his readiness to hold strategic arms talks with the Soviet Union -- that is, talks on those types of nuclear weapons which the two powers have prepared directly for use against each other.

We cannot fail to note that the tone of Washington's statements has changed, that it has softened. "There are more important things than peace..." The present administration's foreign policy proclaimed its birth with this dismal cry. This aphorism has not been forgotten and may perfectly well remain as a scandalous incident in history. But its author, U.S. Secretary of State Haig, would scarcely repeat it now that the Americans' bellicose and conservative sentiments which brought Reagan to the White House are giving way to antiwar and antinuclear sentiments.

The general opinion is that Defense Secretary C. Weinberger is unrivaled among the members of the U.S. Cabinet as the number one hawk. But even he has changed his tune and stopped playing variations on the theme that there are more important things than peace. Quite the opposite. For instance, listen to what he said a week ago in Boston to the Massachusetts Medical Society: "Today I would like to speak on a subject which worries us all equally. I have in mind the threat of nuclear war under which, to our horror, we have been living for 34 years now. This is a supremely unpleasant and difficult subject but it is extremely close to my heart. Some Americans voice doubts as to whether our president and his administration share their aversion for war, particularly nuclear war. That is a terrible misapprehension...."

And so Americans have failed to understand their President and his defense secretary. They share the Americans' aversion to war and they, too, do not want war. Let us go along with this; after all, only real madmen could advocate nuclear war. But the crux of the matter is what a particular policy does -- bring war closer or make it more remote and eliminate the threat. If we look at Washington's policy from this angle we see that it has changed only externally, only with a consideration of the truly global critics, only for camouflage purposes. Because its core has remained the same -- encroachment on the principle of parity and identical security which is fundamental to U.S.-Soviet relations, the attempt to disrupt the prevailing military equilibrium and, by embarking on new rounds of the arms race, seeking superiority over the Soviet Union.

Weinberger confirmed this unaltered core in his same speech to the medical students. Telling them that peace, like health, "requires tending," he explained what he meant by such tending. "In the sphere of arms control," he stated, "we encounter the deplorable paradox whereby the path to peace is marked by preparation for war. There is no other rational solution." It follows from this that the problem of arms control is subordinate to "preparation for war" -- that is, to the arms race. It is well known how long and, to put it mildly, unproductive, this path is.

After President Reagan's Eureka speech in which he announced his readiness for U.S.-Soviet strategic arms limitation talks, many high-ranking Washington officials -- Secretary of State Haig; Rostow, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; the retired General Rowney who has been assigned the task of conducting the strategic arms talks; and Clark, the President's national security aide -- issued statements on U.S. strategy. A combined propaganda operation. They all spoke in unison -- of the horrors of nuclear war, the President's proposals and...the continuation of the arms race. This parallel and even dominant motif attests that the question is merely one of changing Washington's tactics (or, if you like, of defense against a critical public) and not its strategy.

A brief digression into the recent past is in order here. In its first weeks and months in office the present administration frankly emphasized that initially there would be "rearming" and then arms control talks -- from a position of strength. Now there has been a tactical change: both talks and "rearmaments." And the same dream of a position of strength.

While Weinberger has resorted to metaphors and paradoxes, Clark, the President's national security aide, frankly states: "The decisions on strategic nuclear forces which the President announced last fall remain the foundation on which our policy is built." Note that word "foundation."

Then Clark recalls the specific nature of the President's decision: "We intend to modernize manned bombers, enhance the precision and payload of our submarine-launched ballistic missiles, add sea-launched cruise missiles to our arsenal, strengthen our strategic defense and develop new, larger ground-launched ballistic missiles of greater precision."

It is with this program that a country whose president asserts at the same time that the mere limitation of strategic armaments is not enough for him and that he resolutely advocates a considerable reduction in them is approaching the talks. His right hand does not know what his left hand is doing? No, it does know. And it controls his left hand even when the latter is making some peaceable gestures.

The Washington leaders' behavior since Reagan's Eureka speech fully confirms the description given of this speech by L.I. Brezhnev when he addressed the 19th Komsomol Congress. "...The U.S. position is of an absolutely one-sided nature," the Soviet leader said, "primarily because the United States would like to exclude completely from the talks those types of strategic arms which it is now developing most intensively." And further: The U.S. position "is directly aimed at harming the USSR's security and at the same time leaves Washington a free hand in implementing U.S. programs for building up strategic arms."

The idea of limiting and reducing strategic arms arose a long time ago -- long before Reagan appeared in the White House (although, as former U.S. Vice President Mondale attests in a recent article, it is an incumbent U.S. President who has accumulated a 20-year record of opposition to any attempts at nuclear arms control). This is not the first time the Soviet and U.S. sides have intended to sit down at the conference table to discuss this most important problem. In the late sixties and early seventies the formulation of the SALT I agreement went on for 3 years. The history of the formulation of the SALT II treaty -- which, although signed, stuck fast on Capital Hill (and which is already dead, the U.S. administration asserts, although many very eminent U.S. figures are now demanding its resurrection) -- lasted 7 years, and Moscow was not to blame.

During all the upheavals in U.S.-Soviet relations, particularly in the past decade, and for all the changes in the capricious political climate across the ocean, no one has succeeded nor will succeed in freezing the actual idea of U.S.-Soviet dialogue. And if even representatives of an administration which has clearly not held it in honor are now eager for dialogue, then clearly they should at the same time also heed previous useful lessons that have been assimilated.

The Soviet Union mentions them again both in assessing as a step in the right direction the U.S. readiness to resume strategic arms talks and at the same time setting out the approach which could ensure their success and the attainment of an accord.

First, the talks must really pursue the goal of limiting and reducing strategic arms and must not serve as camouflage for continuing the arms race and disrupting the prevailing parity.

Second, both sides must conduct them with a consideration for the legitimate interests of each other's security and in strict accordance with the principle of equality and identical security.

Third, it is necessary to preserve everything positive achieved earlier -- talks do not begin in a vacuum and there is absolutely no sense in forgetting about the large amount of work done previously.

In contrast to the two uncoordinated motifs now being heard in Washington, in Moscow there is just one. The single leitmotif is to close all channels of the arms race, to reach agreement on reducing the level of military confrontation and to push back and totally eradicate the threat of nuclear war.

This leitmotif is emphasized by the Soviet proposal that the strategic weapons of the USSR and the United States be frozen right now, as soon as the talks begin; that talks not be conducted alongside the arms race but that the arms race be frozen. That is one more fundamental difference between the Soviet and U.S. positions. Actually, to be specific, the official U.S. position, after all, as public opinion polls persistently show, by a majority of three to one the Americans support the idea of freezing nuclear arsenals, an idea which is so popular that the administration has so far been totally incapable of destroying it, although it has trained all its big guns against it. The Soviet freeze proposal is a response to sentiments which are profoundly entrenched everywhere, the United States included. But it is not a speculative or demagogic response but one dictated by concern to halt the buildup of nuclear armaments.

In an attempt to justify themselves to their own people, American spokesmen allege that a freeze would only play into the hands of the Soviet Union and would deprive it of the incentive to hold serious talks. This is both topsy-turvy logic and blindness and deafness to the reaction of their talks partner. After all, it is far more logical to suppose that a freeze would help to create a climate for at least the minimal trust so necessary at the talks. And, conversely, the continuation of the arms race alongside the talks would promote a climate of suspicion and hostility.

Of course, many Americans can be frightened away from even very reasonable ideas by hints that these ideas "play into Moscow's hands." Nonetheless, given this reservation, it is perhaps possible to speak today of a more promising paradox than the one Weinberger used as a trump card. It looks as though, in their attitude toward the idea of freezing nuclear arsenals, more Americans are in solidarity with Moscow's position than with the position of official Washington.

SECOND UN SPECIAL SESSION ON DISARMAMENT OPENS

Gromyko Departure From Moscow

LD070730 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 7 Jun 82

[Text] Today Comrade Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, who heads the USSR delegation at the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, left Moscow for New York. He was seen off at the airport by Comrade Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense; Comrade Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretary; and other officials.

Vasilets, Menkes Preview

LD051426 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 5 Jun 82

[By TASS correspondents Valentin Vasilets and Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] New York, 5 Jun, TASS -- The second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament opens here in the building of the United Nations headquarters on June 7. It will be attended by official delegations of 157 member countries of the world community of nations and also by representatives of numerous international public organisations. The Soviet delegation is headed by Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR A.A. Gromyko.

This representative forum is called upon to give a new impulse to talks on ripe questions of limiting the arms race and disarmament, to make a real contribution to the solution of the most pressing problem of our time. The overwhelming majority of the participants in the session clearly realise that the danger of nuclear catastrophe has never been so real.

Studies prepared by United Nations experts for the present forum indicate that nuclear arsenals already hold three tons of explosives for every living person on earth -- adult or child. The destructive power of just one modern submarine armed with nuclear missiles exceeds the yield of all the bombs and shells used during the Second World War. "What is the sense of acquiring ever-new possibilities of destroying one another? It is time to stop. This implies something more than sense of measure. In the long run this concerns the future of mankind," L.I. Brezhnev pointed out.

The Soviet Union is coming to the session with a concrete programme of far-reaching and realistic proposals on curbing the arms race. This programme is outlined in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the appeal of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "to the parliaments and peoples of the world" and developed in L.I. Brezhnev's latest speeches. In the course of the last month alone, preceding the opening of the session the Soviet Union came out with such concrete initiatives as the unilateral termination of the further deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR and a certain reduction of their number, readiness to come to terms that strategic arms of the USSR and the United States already now, the moment talks begin, be frozen quantitatively and that their modernisation be limited to the maximum. Also remaining on the agenda are such earlier made cardinal Soviet proposals as the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, ending of the development and production of new types of such weapons and strengthening guarantees of security of non-nuclear states.

These proposals accord with the aspirations and hopes of all peoples. It is for good reason that the Soviet initiatives are included as key elements in the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament that will be studied by the special session.

To the "peace offensive" of the Soviet Union, the U.S. administration opposed a series of manoeuvres intended to camouflage its true aims. The scope of the anti-war movement in Western Europe and in the United States itself has forced the Washington administration to consent to talks with the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. But in the American approach to the crux of these talks their main task is being sidestepped in every way, the task of lessening and then liquidating the threat of nuclear war. The United States continues to ignore the principle of the equality and equal security of the sides and is staking on securing military advantages over the Soviet Union as a result of talks.

On the eve of the United Nations special session on disarmament the Reagan administration has exerted a maximum of effort in Washington and in Versailles, where a regular conference of the leaders of the seven leading capitalist countries is being held, to overcome the doubts and waverings among its allies and to attach them even closer to the American course of confrontation. It is precisely for this reason, it is pointed out here, that the "leak" was arranged of information about a new memorandum on "national security" signed by Reagan and the Pentagon's new "doctrine" of conducting a "protracted nuclear war." The new presidential policy, stresses the Philadelphia INQUIRER, is aimed at confrontation.

At the same time it is feared in Washington not without reason that this adventuristic course will be subjected to serious criticism and condemnation from the rostrum of the special session of the U.N. General Assembly. To confuse the anti-war movement in West European countries and in the United States itself, to counter criticism of its policy the American administration is resorting to most diverse means.

These include direct distortions of the Soviet initiatives in the field of disarmament and inventions about the "Soviet threat," "peace-making" phraseology and direct attempts to bar representatives of the world public from the discussion of pressing problems of curbing the arms race. On the eve of the session's opening Washington is trying to put up an "iron curtain." Visas were denied to representatives of dozens of anti-war organisations, prominent members of the world movement for peace and journalists from a number of countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia and Latin America.

But notwithstanding the unseemly manoeuvres by the American administration, most participants of the session are fully resolved to exert every effort for the present forum to make a weighty contribution to the cause of restraining the arms race, to become an important milestone along the road to convening a world conference on disarmament.

Parliamentary Group's Message

LD061240 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Address of USSR parliamentary group to the second special UN General Assembly session on disarmament opening in New York 7 June]

[Text] Esteemed participants in the second special UN General Assembly session on disarmament. The USSR parliamentary group, which unites all deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the supreme body of power in the multinational Soviet state, is addressing you with a feeling of deep concern for the prospects of peace on our world, for the future of civilization.

The military danger is growing. There are enough military means stockpiled already which are capable of destroying all life on our world. However, the arms race is continuing. There are forces in the world which, in the name of achieving military superiority, are trying to heap up a mountain of arms and are making plans -- dangerous to all of mankind -- for a limited nuclear war and for being the first to use nuclear arms. They are trying to legitimize the new lethal types of weapons for mass destruction.

The Soviet Union, seriously concerned about the course of events on the international arena, is multiplying its efforts preserve and further detente, restrain the arms race and develop good-neighborly cooperation and friendship among peoples.

This principled course is the behest of the great Lenin, founder of the Soviet state. It has found outstanding expression in the peace program for the eighties worked out by the 26th CPSU Congress, and was logically continued and developed in the large-scale peaceful initiatives put forward recently by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

We, the parliamentarians of the Soviet Union, expressing the will of our electorates and the entire people of our country, have on many occasions stated and we state again: We consider that all measures should be taken without delay to avert a nuclear catastrophe, put an end to the madness of the arms race and achieve stable peace and reliable security for all of mankind. We consider that the huge material and intellectual resources currently being swallowed up in military preparations should be directed toward bettering the lives of people, toward solving humanitarian national and global problems -- environmental protection, the fight against starvation and the search for new sources of energy and raw materials. We consider that there should be stable peace in the world which would serve the development of the creative energies of the peoples, progress in science and technology and the creation of material and spiritual riches for present and future generations.

A year ago the USSR Supreme Soviet unanimously adopted an address to the parliaments and peoples of the world which contained an appeal for active dialogue and for resolving all controversial problems at the conference table. This is our approach to current international affairs today, too. This is the will of Soviet people.

Being all too aware of the worries which concern the world today, we at the same time do not give in to pessimism. We are convinced that the present situation can be changed for the better, that it is possible to remove the threat of war. Here the second special UN General Assembly session is called upon to make its contribution to solving this vitally important task facing mankind.

In conclusion, the address of the USSR parliamentary group says: Being conscious of the enormous responsibility to all people living now and to future generations, we address UN members with an appeal to do their utmost to save peace on earth. It is necessary to adopt most urgent and realistic measures with a view to achieving progress in the cause of banning the development, production, stockpiling and deployment of all kinds of weapons for mass destruction. Needing urgent solution are the tasks of freezing nuclear arsenals and their radical limitation and reduction. A limit should be put on the growth of conventional armed forces and armaments and provisions made for their reduction.

It is our duty to leave for future generations a world not mutilated by explosions but flourishing, as Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has been emphasizing. To keep the earth from darkness, it is necessary to create insurmountable barriers to nuclear war without delay. To save our world from the danger threatening it, to preserve peace -- this is the supreme duty of the international community. We believe in the victory of reason.

SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDUM RATIFIES WEAPONS LIMIT

LD061518 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun, TASS -- By a decree of June 2, 1982 the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR ratified the convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects signed on behalf of the USSR in New York on April 10, 1981.

SPECIFICATIONS OF TRIDENT MISSILE SYSTEM VIEWED

PMO21051 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 May 82 p 3

[Engr Capt 1st Rank G. Semenov "Military-Technical Review": "The Trident System, or Zigzags of Underwater Strategy"]

[Text] According to the scheme of the U.S. military-political leadership, submarine-launcher nuclear forces are to be one of the main "strike components" of the strategic triad (long-range bombers, the MX missiles and the Trident system) -- the most survivable component and extremely flexible in use. They already account for over 70 percent of the total number of missile warheads in the U.S. strategic nuclear forces. "Nonetheless," foreign observers note, Frank (Barnaby) in particular, "The United States is increasing its orientation toward ballistic missiles launched from nuclear submarines in order to ensure guaranteed nuclear destruction." This is the aim served by the deployment of the Trident system.

The equipping of the U.S. Navy with Trident missiles, Pentagon strategists believe, will enable American submarines to operate at great distances submerged, striking against targets in the Soviet Union, AP points out.

The Reagan administration is currently spurring on the arms race and the implementation of the plans for creating new submarines specially designed to accommodate the new ballistic missiles. According to preliminary calculations, the program for their deployment will cost the American taxpayer over \$30 billion.

Thus the Trident system incorporates three main elements: new Ohio-class nuclear submarines with 24-ballistic-missile launch tubes (instead of the 16 on submarines of the Polaris and Poseidon system), new intercontinental missiles and a new basing system. What is each element like?

The Ohio-class missile submarine has a length of 171 meters, a beam of 12.8 meters and a draught of 10.8 meters. Its dive displacement is 18,700 tons. The size of the ship is dictated by the need to accommodate 24 large ballistic missiles. The large displacement, according to the plan of the U.S. Navy, makes it possible to use various measures to reduce the [submarine's] acoustic field, to accommodate a large quantity of radioelectronic equipment and to reserve in the compartments the weight and space for future modernizations.

The new S8G nuclear power plant, which has a water-moderated water-cooled reactor with a fuel core service life of 9 years (almost double that of existing American ships), develops 30,000-shaft horsepower. This is to provide a maximum speed of around 25 knots and the possibility of crossing to the patrol areas at a higher quiet speed than existing missile submarines. The diving depth is around 400 meters and the submarine has a crew of 156.

While it is gambling on ballistic missiles, the U.S. Navy command is planning to equip Ohio-class submarines with other types of weapons as well. They will include MK 48 dual-purpose deep-water torpedoes, which have a maximum range of 46 km and a speed of 93 kph, and Harpoon antiship cruise missiles (their range is over 90 km), which it is planned to fire using 4 hydraulic torpedo devices of a new design.

The basis of the ship's sonar apparatus is the BQQ-6 complex, which makes extensive use of digital computer technology designed to ensure great speed of operation, accurate direction-finding and the necessary classification of targets. The complex includes a long-range sonar unit and a hydrophone unit with an 8-cm uniform antenna towed at a distance of up to 800 meters from the ship. There is also sonar countermeasures apparatus, including instruments that mimic the sound of a submarine.

The navigational equipment, on whose accuracy the effectiveness of the firing of the ballistic missiles depends in large measure, includes two of the improved SINS inertial systems, an ESGM inertial system and Loran-C and transit onboard radio navigation apparatus. In the assessments of American specialists, the utilization of the ESGM system, based on gyroscopes with an electrostatically supported rotor, will make it possible to reduce the number of times the ship surfaces to check its position and thereby improve its concealment.

In an endeavor to reduce the ship's vulnerability, the creators of the Ohio missile submarine paid special attention to lessening its acoustic field. In particular, the new reactor makes it possible to move at slow speeds without switching on the main circulating pumps -- the second biggest source of noise on the ship after the steam turbines. Sound, insulating barriers have been used for the noisiest machinery, sound-absorbent coatings are extensively utilized, and so forth.

It is expected that the Ohio will go out on its first combat patrol in the third quarter of this year. It is planned to build 16 new missile submarines, and the intention is to hand 7 of them over to the U.S. Navy before 1986. However, foreign specialists believe that the Trident system will include at least 25 ships of this type. The current cost of one of these ships is more than \$1.2 billion.

Unlike previous American submarine-launched ballistic missiles, the new missile (Trident I) is a three-stage missile. With a length of 10.36 meters, a diameter of 1.88 meters and a launch weight of 29.5 tons, its range is 7,400 km. The nosecone houses 8 warheads, and the yield of each of them is double that of a Poseidon missile.

The Trident I missile was adopted in 1979 and, since the building of the Ohio had been delayed, the zigzags of underwater strategy meant that it began to be installed on submarines of the Poseidon system (so far 12 ships have been refitted).

Accelerated development of the Trident II missile, with a range of over 11,000 km, is also underway. It will have a nosecone with 150-kiloton maneuvering warheads capable of performing preprogrammed maneuvers in the atmosphere. The emphasis is on securing great accuracy -- of the order of 230 meters. The end of development is planned for the second half of the eighties. The possibility of fitting the Trident I with the MK 500 nosecone is also under consideration.

It has been decided that the area of Bangor, on the west coast of the United States, will be the permanent base of the new underwater nuclear forces. There, alongside the Navy ballistic missile arsenal on the east shore of the Hood Canal, a delta-shaped repair and harbor complex with two piers and a dry dock, a covered moorage for loading and unloading ballistic missiles and tactical weapons, a coilless degaussing and noise control station and a crew training center has been constructed.

The Trident marine strategic system occupied a prominent place in the plans for the buildup of American imperialism's military might. Each submarine represents 24 ballistic missile launchers and 192 nuclear warheads. It is the most expensive military program in all U.S. history. In short, when the military-industrial complex seeks to make fortunes out of another spiral of the arms race, the threat to peace increases,

INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE PROGRAM

LD062116 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 6 Jun 82

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Vladimirov Shishlin, international affairs journalists; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, all-union radio foreign affairs commentator]

Disarmament Talks

[Text] [Levin] Hello, respected comrade listeners. June began with very great political events and in the days to come will be marked by a particularly important event, the special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament which opens tomorrow in New York. Defining our position, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has in recent days stressed several times that the Soviet Union will do its utmost to foster the success of this special session, both by word and deed. This appears both in the reply to Palme, the chairman of the independent commission on questions of disarmament and security and a well-known Swedish political figure, and at the dinner in honor of the Austrian president, Kirchsclaeger. The Soviet Union consistently speaks in favor of the limitation and liquidation of nuclear weapons, and our recently-made proposals open more favourable opportunities for fruitful negotiations on these problems. Everybody's attention is now riveted to the special session the UN General Assembly because at the central question of modern times is in focus, the question of ending the arms race which is fraught with immense dangers for mankind.

[Bovin] Like any other session, it is preceded by diplomatic preparation by the countries and governments concerned, but a special feature of this session of the General Assembly lies in the fact that in recent months preparations of a completely different kind have been going on, if you like. The whole antiwar, antinuclear movement which developed first in Western Europe, then swept over Japan, then over the United States -- this is, by the way, also a preparation for this session, a preparation which shows that people are tired of living in fear, that people are tired of living with the promonition and presentiment of a nuclear catastrophe. They want to get out of this blind alley, force the governments of the Western countries to move toward disarmament, and this upsurge of mass movements has undoubtedly already had an effect on the stance of the Western powers. For example, the stream of peace-loving words, literally a stream, which has recently been coming from the White House, and in particular from the lips of the U.S. President himself, is in my view connected to a significant extent with the fact that the President wants somehow to maneuver himself and his government away from the blow which is being felt quite painfully.

[Shishlin] Incidentally, upon his arrival in Europe, the President made the surprising statement that he is the first American President to persuade the Russians to sit down at the negotiating table to discuss the problem of disarmaments.

[Bovin] Yes, I also read that; but you see, how much can be expected of Reagan? He has often said very strange things. Perhaps this is simply connected with his ignorance of the factual side of the matter, but he did indeed say that.

Preparation for the session also went on from another angle: the sitting of the Palme commission which you mentioned for instance. This is no longer exactly the public. He is a figure at a high political level. Specialists in disarmament problems, figures from the most varied countries, of the level of Vance, for example, like Palme himself, like Bahr, who have done a great deal of work to clarify the real opportunities for disarmament which exist now in the world, and in the report which the commission published there is a mass of quite interesting proposals which attract attention.

[Levin] In that connection I would like to cite the words of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, spoken at the recent reception in honour of the CSSR party and government delegation headed by Comrade Husak. Comrade Brezhnev said: Political wisdom consists today in persistently, patiently and through joint efforts seeking solutions to the problems which are fraught with the threat to world peace.

And, of course, it is especially important to lead the most urgent problem of our times, the curtailment of the arms race and disarmament, out of a blind alley.

[Bovin] In practice, negotiations are now either in progress or about to begin on all three main directions. First, on 29 June talks on strategic arms will begin with the Americans; in Geneva negotiations on medium-range nuclear arms are in progress; and, as is well known, in Vienna negotiations are in progress on armaments and armed forces in Central Europe.

But unfortunately, it is still difficult to talk here of optimistic predictions. The talks will undoubtedly be difficult. Well, difficult is just a general term, but why is there this difficulty? This is the question troubling everybody. And if one doesn't use some sort of sophisticated strategic language for this purpose, one could say that the main difficulty consists of the fact that our Western partners, and the Americans in particular, are in general constantly striving to outsmart us. This is the essence of it, in simple terms.

[Shishlin] And moreover, there is always some kind of temporary break in the Reagan position. On the one hand, he now says that the United States is supposedly ready to hold honest and businesslike talks with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the concrete American proposals themselves, as you quite rightly say, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, are truly pursuing the aim of gaining a strictly one-sided advantage for the United States, the aim of gaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. And there is the question of what will happen between the time when the ideas at the talks are put forward and the sides sit down around the table negotiating and the time when these talks finish? Reagan himself insists that the talks cannot be short. They will be long. And during this time, all the American programs are being put forward for an arms build-up, including strategic, medium-range and tactical weaponry, and all these programs will be implemented.

[Levin] And they must lead to the achievement of military superiority, according to the plans of their initiators. Recently, the New York TIMES published an article with the following title: "The Pentagon Has Worked Out Its First Strategy for Conducting Prolonged Nuclear War." And in it, masses of various measures are envisaged...

[Shishlin interrupts]...And you know, Viktor Nikolayevich, forgive me for interrupting you, the very lead of this Pentagon report is of course just another trick by the Washington administration. It is an attempt to intimidate the Soviet Union, to make it think that the current line of thought is...

[Bovin interrupts]...that if you don't accept our proposals, then here is what you'll have to deal with.

[Shishlin] This is what you will have to face up to.

[Levin] Quite right. This is the political aspect. But this program also has a practical side to it. It is a program of arms build-up. The Americans, moreover -- I mean the Pentagon -- are not only talking of building up nuclear arms, but they are also devoting enormous attention to the development of -- as they say -- conventional weapons. It is envisaged, for example, that during the period up to 1991, they will create 25 divisions instead of the current 16 divisions. Instead of the 13 aircraft carriers of today, they will have 22. The air force is also spreading its wings, and Marine units expanding. Enormous attention is being devoted to developing military transport aviation. That is there is an arms build-up in all areas. Of course, the article published in last Friday's PRAVDA -- "What Is Behind the U.S. 'Readiness' To Reduce Nuclear Arms?" -- investigates all the issues involved in the American position in a very concrete and detailed way, and shows what is behind the proposals mentioned by the American administration, the statement made by Reagan, which you quoted, that he achieved the Soviet Union to finally agree to sit down around a table for talks is in my opinion, very characteristic of the present administration's position. It is trying to present itself in a light which does not exist in reality.

[Bovin] By the way, in connection with the fact that Reagan arrived in Europe on the 2d of the month, the American press, in complete frankness, wrote that this trip is in many ways also a self-advertizing trip. All these speeches by Reagan are supposed, so to speak, to change the European's impression of him as a bellicose figure and present him in a role of peace-maker, as a nice American grandfather figure who has come with an olive branch, and so on and so forth, of someone who could play the part of leader of the capitalist world, because this was also being subjected to some doubt of late. And there you have (?some of) the psychological aspects of Reagan's present visit to West Europe.

[Levin] It would seem to be precisely in the light of this conclusion that one should also view the approach of the Americans and the American side to the talks on strategic weapons which start on 29 June. The Americans have abandoned the old title of limitation of strategic arms, and now call it reduction of strategic arms, but what they are proposing is in reality not a step forward but a step back, at least if one is to judge from the official position of the United States.

Meanwhile, the position of the Soviet Union -- our position stems from the peace program developed by the 26th CPSU Congress -- is precise and absolutely clear. I would also stress that it is absolutely honest. We are not seeking any one-sided advantages for ourselves, but we are raising the question of a real limitation, a reduction of armaments. In this respect, of course, the immense reaction to the latest Soviet proposals put forward by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the trade union congress, in Tashkent, and at the Komsomol congress is quite natural and understandable. This is indeed a program which envisages the possibility of eliminating all nuclear armaments in Europe, both medium-range and tactical. It is also a program for a real reduction in strategic armaments.

[Shishlin] I think that during his 16 months in the White House, Reagan has sensed that his political position is vulnerable, in light of the preparation for the second special [UN disarmament] session, which has already been mentioned today. It is vulnerable both on the broad international level and in terms of the alignment of domestic political forces in the United States itself.

[Levin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, I want to illustrate your point with one single example. A public opinion poll conducted recently by the New York TIMES and the CBS television company showed that almost 3/4 of Americans are in favor of an end to the nuclear arms race.

[Shishlin] Eighty-three percent of Americans are in favor of a nuclear arms freeze. I think that this second special UN session will unquestionably demonstrate the fact that the political position of the hawks, if you like, is not ideal in today's world political climate. I think that this session and, in general, the events which await us in the summer of this year, will create the necessary psychological climate for further broad and vigorous actions directed precisely at a curtailment of the arms race, although at the moment rosy hopes are of course...

[Bovin interrupts]...While the Reagan administration remains in power, talks will be held and should be held. But in view of the nature of the team which surrounds Reagan it is not difficult to see that talks with the Americans may be very confused. However, I repeat, the talks should of course be held. This is very important.

[Shishlin] I was just going to say that this whole process should not be viewed in a particularly rosy light. This is because we have the experience of Vienna. We already have some experience of the Geneva talks on medium-range nuclear weapons. And we have had an opportunity to learn the views of the present U.S. administration, to learn about the package of ideas and considerations which they want to expound at the talks with the Soviet Union. In this respect, of course, there is probably also room for a view of the future that is not optimistic. However, in the broader context, of course, the context which takes account of all the social processes which are taking place in the world, of the standpoint of the Europeans and the Japanese -- and I do not mean public movements only but also the position taken by responsible political circles, ruling circles -- we can say that the idea that it is necessary to call a halt, that it is time to call a halt, that it is stupid, pointless and, if you like...

[Bovin interrupts] Criminal.

[Shishlin] Criminal, criminal to accumulate more and more ways of destroying each other. That is gaining ground in the awareness of the masses.

[Levin] Replying to the questions of the editor-in-chief of the Indian newspaper PATRIOT, Mishra, the head of our government, Comrade Tikhonov, said that we make a sober assessment of the alignment and dynamics of various political forces in the world. The successes of our policy do not induce complacency in Soviet people. Setbacks do not make them pessimists. We have confidence in ourselves and believe in the triumph of reason, progress and justice. We view the future with optimism. And this is justified optimism. One of the reasons for this optimism is the existence of the community of socialist states, the joint coordinated policy of the fraternal states. In this respect both the visit to the Soviet Union by a party and government delegation from the CSSR, headed by Comrade Husak, and the recent conversation between Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and Comrade Le Duan, the leader of the Vietnamese Communists, merit special attention.

SSR's Husak Visit

[Shishlin] The visit of the Czechoslovak party and government delegation to our country had a multifaceted nature, of course, and if the foreground seemed to be occupied by direct, bilateral Soviet-Czechoslovak relations, there was also discussion of the coordination of the foreign-policy activity of our states. The visit was without question 100 percent successful, although this does not mean that complex problems were not discussed. Complex problems were also discussed, because both in our own economic development and in the economic development of Czechoslovakia there are issues which require new efforts in order to remove them, and I think the comrades noticed that Leonid Ilich, speaking at the dinner in honour of the Czechoslovak friends, drew particular attention to the need to deepen economic cooperation, in particular in such an area as that of scientific-technical progress. We are not turning in a new page here. We have good experience of cooperation with our Czechoslovak friends, in particular in such a front-ranking industry as atomic-power engineering.

Without doubt, if all that was mapped out during the visit is successfully implemented -- and we have every reason to believe it will be -- and if new, close cooperation succeeds in those industries which set the pace of modern technology and have a high scientific-technical level, then this of course will become a kind of accelerator for the development not only of Czechoslovakia, and not only the Soviet Union, because both Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union have been counting on conducting this work jointly with the other socialist countries. I will adduce just one example: Our German comrades, for instance, are now devoting a great deal of attention to the production of robots. They expect to introduce 45,000 robots into the national economy in the coming 5-year plan and the criterion is a simple one: The robot is being introduced into those production processes where there is a possibility of saving a minimum of three working men. On the economic side too a fairly strict account is being kept, and this direction, of course, is very, very promising. But, behind these economic matters, of course, the visit to our country by the Czech friends also has a very big political content, because we conducted a sort of general review of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations, and this general review has without doubt been successful. In all directions, in all areas, Soviet-Czechoslovak relations are moving forward.

[Bovin] Well, incidentally, if I may use your expression of a general review, in Western Europe there has been a parallel general review of the economic policy of the leading Western powers, I have in mind the session, the meeting you all know about, comrades, of the seven leaders, which has taken place in Versailles.

[Levin] It is still continuing today.

Versailles Summit Meeting

[Bovin] Yes, today. It began on Friday. Friday, Saturday, Sunday. It should end today. We haven't got the final document of this conference, but in general we can imagine what the talk has been about.

Let us take three groups: Japan, West Europe and the United States. Well, the Japanese, I believe, behaved as quietly as possible, because the main thing for them is that their export opportunities should not be curtailed, and that they should not be compelled to open their doors too wide to American and West European imports. That has been the main aim of the Japanese, so to speak, to somehow maintain their positions, although they can afford some concessions. On the other hand, the positions in this respect in West Europe and America -- this is perhaps the thing West Europe and America agreed on -- are to put as much pressure as possible on the Japanese; to remove the enormous trade deficits which are being formed with Japan in West Europe and America. This is the first, somewhat tense field of contradictions. Then there is the main interest of the Europeans. After all, the Europeans consider that the main factor holding the West Europe economy in recession and a state of uncertainty is the economic policy of Reagan: those huge interest rates, the rising exchange rate of the dollar. Europe considers that it is precisely here that the roots of the present economic slump are to be found.

One year ago, in Ottawa, Reagan said something like this: "Don't worry, be patient, our affairs will soon start going well. There will be an upswing and then everything will sort itself out." A year has passed and there has been no upswing. The Europeans are once again no better off than they were at the start: Unemployment is growing, and they will of course try to pressure the Americans so that they move over a bit and start acting less selfishly. But for the Americans, the position is like this: Why are you bothering us? We have a free economy. We don't want the government to interfere in monetary matters, except in extreme cases. Let all this be regulated by the play of free economic forces. From the Americans' point of view, the main thing is not these concrete matters which the Europeans have been describing, but free trade. They don't want any protectionist barriers.

But apart from this, the Americans also have another interest for which they have come to Europe. That is to try and impose on their West European partners and Japan a tightening in the field of economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. Reagan, as you know, has from the beginning attacked the agreement on gas pipes. Well, here he fell flat on his face, but now he proposes to severely cut back on granting credits. It is current world practice for any large deal to be accompanied by credits. Reagan is proposing to raise the price of these credits, narrow the possibility of obtaining credits and thus arrive at the same result -- that is, to severely narrow down the possibility of economic cooperation. In addition to this, he is also proposing to tighten up the system regulating the sale to us of, say, leading technology.

[Shishlin] Well, in general, this is quite right, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich. This policy, on the part of the United States does achieve a little: The socialist countries are experiencing some difficulties on the world market. From this policy, the socialist countries are drawing another major inference: that one must improve cooperation with one another, that one must stride forward more boldly along the path of deepening socialist economic integration. This is the correct conclusion.

[Levin] It is the only correct one. Added to which, we cannot fail to see that the economic crisis in the capitalist world, in view of the broad development of our economic relations, exerts a negative influence on the socialist countries. Let me quote some figures illustrating the economic position of the West. The level of industrial production in the United States in 1981 rose by only 2 percent; in Britain, it fell by 3 percent; in France, it fell by 0.2 percent; in the FRG, it rose by 0.3 percent; in Italy, by 0.3 percent. Canada is marking time. Only Japan is continuing to move forward; the increase in industrial production last year constituted 4.1 percent, but this is still less than they expected and anticipated. This is the background for the development of a situation which is provoking particular alarm in West Europe, and probably not only in West Europe but in the capitalist world as a whole -- the unprecedented growth in unemployment.

[Bovin] Here precisely lies one of the lines of disagreement between Reagan and, let's say, Mitterrand, and this is becoming evident at Versailles. Reagan considers the main thing to be the struggle against inflation.

If one lowers inflation then everything else will fall into place and unemployment will disappear. But Mitterrand and Schmidt take a different approach, that one must above all solve the problem of unemployment. This is the main problem, because it is not only economic but also social. Everything else can be tackled later.

[Levin] For Schmidt this problem is really important. Elections are taking place in Hamburg today for the city senate and the results may, to a serious extent, even determine the fate of the government. If the Social Democrats lose these elections and their position is shaken, then the correlation of forces in the Bundesrat could change so much in favour of the Christian Democratic Union [CDU]-Christian Social Union [CSU] bloc that the government would be made powerless. This is why these social problems, just as the antiwar movement, the decisive demand to reject the deployment of American missiles on the territory of the Federal Republic, have now become demands by the masses which representatives of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] cannot afford to ignore.

I would like to return once again to statistics on unemployment in capitalist countries, since they are truly horrifying. In the United States the number of jobless reached the highest level since the great depression. According to official figures 10.3 million people are out of work.

[Bovin] And in the developed countries it is believed that there are now 30 million people out of work.

[Levin] Yes, that's what they say.

[Bovin] The conclave at Versailles is meeting against the background of this figure. They will recall that their first conference was held in 1975 at Rambouillet at the suggestion of Giscard d'Estaing. At that time Giscard (told Frenchmen) that the world was heading for a catastrophe and that they must hold a meeting to decide what to do. Since then they have been meeting every year. Some decisions were taken and some compromises were reached. But, generally speaking, the economic situation has gotten worse from meeting to meeting. There were some small upturns; but unemployment is increasing. Inflation is increasing. And economic growth has been minimal, generally speaking.

[Shishlin] Of course, for Reagan's colleagues it is quite simply not worth trying to add a curtailment and sharp reduction of economic ties with the socialist world to the present economic difficulties. It is unprofitable.

[Levin] But another reason Reagan wants this is to undermine the economic position of his partners and obtain more freedom of operation for U.S. monopolies. Generally speaking, I think the very fact that the meetings of the big seven are held indicates that there is a very serious change in the correlation of forces in the capitalist world.

[Bovin] Understandably, if there are to be any specific results from this meeting, they will be very small ones. But if you take a general view of this meeting, it is of course a rather new way for capitalism to adapt itself to a world which is changing to the disadvantage of capitalism. The meetings of the seven are one of these ways. Multilateral commissions on a nongovernmental level which try to solve the same problems, which bind all the centers of capitalism, are another way. But as far as specific results are concerned, Versailles, like the previous meetings, will hardly lead to anything substantial. There will be general words of agreement, which will mask disagreement on specific issues.

[Levin] The special security measures are probably the only thing which will distinguish the Versailles meeting from its predecessors.

[Bovin] They even installed antiaircraft batteries around the palace.

[Levin] Six batteries.

[Bovin] Yes.

[Levin] Six batteries to prevent overflights by various private aircraft. But in general that is also typical of...

[Bovin interrupts] ...the general situation.

[Levin] The general situation, yes. Many problems of course do face the world. Economic questions are of great importance for capitalist countries, and naturally we do not overlook them either. We have these problems too. And as it happens, we discuss these problems. We have a precise and clear program. That is what distinguishes our approach, our situation, from the situation in capitalist countries. This was especially clearly demonstrated by the May party Central Committee plenums which adopted the Food Program. We really have confidence that our plans for peaceful, creative labor, on which we are concentrating our efforts are realistic ones. Of course we need peace for this. We do not support peace only to facilitate our economic growth. We support peace because this is the ideal of socialism. This is the ideal of socialism. There are still quite a few difficulties on the path, of course. But our path is distinct and clear. It was determined by the decisions of the 26th party congress. Our country and the fraternal socialist countries are advancing along this path firmly and confidently.

At this point our program is over. Thank you for your attention, comrade listeners.

NONALIGNED MEETING ENDS; DOCUMENTS ADOPTED

LD061102 Moscow TASS in English 1054 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Havana, 6 Jun, TASS -- The session of the coordination bureau of non-aligned countries at foreign ministers' level has ended in the Havana Palace of Congresses. The bureau discussed the major problems of our times -- the strengthening of peace, struggle for disarmament and detente, against imperialism, the situation in the "hot spots" of the world, and matters of a more just international economic order. The participants in the session adopted a number of documents, and approved a final document which expresses firm solidarity with the peoples of Argentina, Central American and Caribbean countries, as well as with the peoples of Palestine, Namibia and a number of other countries upholding their independence. The participants in the session condemned the arms race and declared for a solution to contentious problems through negotiations.

DISPUTE BENEFITS BRITISH ARMS MANUFACTURERS

PM041311 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 May 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent V. Skosyrev dispatch: "Who Profits From the Bloodshed"]

[Text] In the Anglican cathedral in Portsmouth a service was in progress. Sailors of the destroyer Sheffield which sunk in the Atlantic were being commemorated. First the priest addressed words of comfort to the relatives from the church porch, then the voices of the young choir members rang out. Portsmouth is the port where the destroyer was registered and so the funeral service for the dead was being held there.

Funeral services are being held in other cities too. The assault on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, which a month ago the commander of the British squadron Adm S. Woodward frivolously compared with a walkover, has proved to a bloody operation. The British are having to pay a high price for the colonial expedition undertaken by the Tory government.

Moreover, however the conflict ends, there are circles in the British Isles which will be the winners in any case. These are the military-industrial monopolies. While the share prices of most industrial companies on the London Stock Exchange are fluctuating, the share value of concerns which produce armaments are rising.

And it is not difficult to understand why. "If Britain gains the upper hand in the fighting, the country will experience a boost in militarist feelings and the government will increase defense spending not by the annual 3 percent as it promised (in accordance with the NATO decision), but at a more accelerated rate. If the campaign proves unsuccessful, then expensive equipment will need to be replaced. Probably political pressure will be exerted to correct shortcomings in Britain's defense," THE TIMES wrote recently.

The greater the British losses, the greater the sum which the merchants of death hope to snatch. Five companies dominate the British electronic armaments market: British Aerospace, GEC, Ferranti, Plessey and Racal. British Aerospace, which produces the Harrier fighter bombs and also various classes of missiles, last year sold armaments worth \$2.2 billion. It is expected that this year the demand for the products of all five firms will sharply increase.

Both participants in the confrontation are equipped with the standard armaments of the North Atlantic bloc. This aspect of the war has been wittily depicted by a cartoonist of London's THE TIMES: Cruisers loom on his drawing and on their side is inscribed: "Choose American goods!" and a placard is stretched between the periscopes of the submarines: "Trust West German goods." Missiles and fighters are scudding about in the sky with the pennants: "Buy French!" And "Made in Britain".

The crisis in the South Atlantic provided the opportunity for the leading Western concerns to advertize their wares and also to test them out in practice. And the NATO military leaders are drawing lessons from the experience of the British armada. One of these lessons is crystallized quite succinctly: They will propose that Britain increase its navy. Let us recall that over the last decade in connection with losses of colonies and economic difficulties London has been forced to reduce the number of ships and scrap several aircraft carriers.

For the Washington strategists the fighting off the shores of Latin America has opened up a unique opportunity to galvanize the plans to create a NATO "fire-brigade" to wage local wars beyond the frontiers on this bloc's zone. "The whole episode (concerning the islands) shows how a comparatively small scrap of territory with a very small population can provoke large-scale military efforts," E. Meese, U.S. presidential counselor, says. Hence, in his opinion, the need has emerged for the West to have naval forces which could "bring order" in the hotspots of the planet and primarily in the Near East.

It is clear that the British Conservatives' military adventure has far-reaching consequences. For many years Western propaganda has been reiterating that the threat to international stability comes from the Soviet Union. Well? It only needed an armed dispute to break out in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands for one of NATO's leading powers to transfer 3/4 of its fleet there, and also aircraft and infantry units, and for a battery of air defense missiles to be removed from its position in West Germany.

The conclusion is obvious: Neither London nor the other capitals of the North Atlantic bloc states believe in the possibility of a "Soviet attack". The myth about this is needed by the West to justify the arms race aimed at achieving superiority over the socialist countries. The Anglo-Argentinian conflict graphically confirms that the real threat to peace is posed by the policy of imperialism, which is symbolized today by the aggressive actions of Britain in the South Atlantic.

MOSCOW DENIES USSR TAKING ADVANTAGE OF CONFLICT

PY042106 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2200 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Commentary by Vladimir Lapskiy]

[Text] The U.S. media assert that the Soviet Union is taking advantage of the Anglo-Argentine conflict to cause unrest between the United States and Latin American countries, but there is nothing more untrue than such a statement. Right from the beginning the Soviet Union has voiced its support for a peaceful solution to the conflict in the South Atlantic.

During the urgent meeting recently held by the UN Security Council, the Soviet permanent representative to the United Nations once again pointed out that the Soviet Union advocates the immediate and definite cessation of all military operations in the Malvinas/Falkland Islands area.

The Soviet representative stated that the UN resolution regarding the solution to the crisis should be implemented immediately. This is the Soviet position regarding the Anglo-Argentine conflict.

Our country has done nothing which could worsen this conflict. However, the same thing cannot be stated about Washington. In the first place the United States tried to appear as an impartial intermediary, but this did not last long since imperialist interests prevailed. Washington set aside its impartial position and definitely took side with London's colonialist policy. The United States' moral support became a direct political and military support for England. In the meantime, not long ago, Washington was still making statements regarding inter-American solidarity, voicing its agreement with strategic interests, voicing its decision to defend Latin American countries against foreign intervention, and so on.

One does not need to be an accomplished psychologist to imagine the feelings which the U.S. position regarding the conflict arose among the Argentines and the Latin Americans in general.

It is opportune to quote a passage of an article by Mario Rolon Anaya, outstanding political leader and former Bolivian foreign minister, published by the daily EL DIARIO which states: What sad lessons Latin America is learning at present due to the continuation of the Malvinas Falkland Islands crisis. These events have revealed how inhuman neocolonialism and imperialism are when their interests are affected. This conflict has proven that treason, vileness and deception are inherent to the U.S. government. All Washington's talk about the equal status of Latin American countries, about the need for cooperation, lose all weight when the U.S. has to choose between developing countries and its Western allies of NATO. It was precisely in the name of NATO that the OAS and the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty (TIAR) were sacrificed. In the end all U.S. declarations regarding the continental security fell into oblivion. This is what Mario Rolon Anaya wrote. One could not say anything truer than this. With the Anglo-Argentine conflict the United States has revealed what it has always been and will always be: An imperialist power which puts its own egoistic interests in the first place for the benefit of its personal advantages.

In referring to the consequences of the U.S. policy in the South Atlantic, New York TIMES observer Bernard Gwertzman a few days ago wrote: The U.S. decision to support England has caused great damage to the [word indistinct] of the U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere. It is possible that the damage caused by that decision will be irreparable.

There are many similar opinions in the U.S. media. Therefore, the criticisms by the U.S. propaganda in the sense that the Soviet Union is trying to cause unrest between the United States and its southern neighbors are absolutely absurd and ridiculous. In this regard, Washington did everything, without anybody's help, to get at loggerheads with the Latin Americans and cause their justified indignation.

CANADIAN, CHILEAN AID TO BRITISH CITED

PY061112 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish to Latin America 0130 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] A Canadian military delegation, which also includes military representatives from the United States, Great Britain and Australia, has arrived in Chile. It has been officially reported that the delegation will study international defense and political issues for 1 year in Santiago. However, even a neophyte in international issues can see that this report on the objective of the presence of the English-speaking military officers in Santiago is obviously false. A person would have to be quite naive to believe U.S. generals and the British military [word indistinct] to grant courses of instruction to their Chilean colleagues since they have enough experience to [words indistinct] with citizens from their own country.

However, logic leads us to a completely different conclusion. The main objective of this original military disembarkation which is supported by the respective diplomatic services is to push the Pinochet gang to take part in the Anglo-British [as heard] conflict but of course in support for Great Britain. The fact that the group is operating under the Canadian banner does not change the situation at all. This banner, as well as the participation of Canada and Australia, is nothing more than Anglo-Saxon solidarity with the British aggression in the South Atlantic. Moreover, it is camouflage for the primary role which the United States and the United Kingdom are undertaking in this armed aggression.

Furthermore, it is also quite understandable why this military-diplomatic disembarkation has taken place precisely in Chile. Pinochet's statement about Chilean neutrality in the Malvinas conflict is a fib since it is (?a fact) that the fascist regime is participating in it. It is enough to say that British helicopters transported by sea are assembled in the southern region of Chile and that [words indistinct] are sent to the combat area. The British transportation planes use the airport at Easter Island while Chilean auxiliary ships help the [word indistinct] navy.

Moreover, Chilean generals are inclined to (?launch) military actions against Argentina with the objective of solving the Argentine-Chilean dispute over the Beagle Channel islands, particularly since the Anglo-Argentine conflict offers a good opportunity to do so.

The British and U.S. [words indistinct] in Santiago, are followed with great concern by other Latin American countries, particularly by Peru and Bolivia, countries which are also viewed with great hatred by Pinochet. All this is part of the dangerous plans of the two imperialist powers to unleash a war on the continent which may be extended to all South America.

U.S. STANCE ON S. ATLANTIC CONFLICT EXAMINED

True Intentions Revealed

PY050118 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2200 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Vladimir Korotkov commentary]

[Text] The crisis over the Malvinas/Falkland Islands has compelled many Latin Americans to review their positions with the United States.

The media of the continent now state that the United States has betrayed Latin America by taking side with England in its colonial war against Argentina. The media point out that the so-called pan-American solidarity has proven to be mere rhetoric and the Rio de Janeiro Treaty to be useless. Through this treaty the United States had solemnly undertaken the commitment to defend its southern neighbors from foreign aggression.

By an overwhelming majority of votes the OAS approved a resolution without any precedents in the OAS's entire history, which decidedly condemns the U.S. activities.

However, the U.S. position in this conflict is by no means unexpected. It is quite natural that the essence and character of Washington's attitude regarding its southern partners should be revealed. History proves this with sufficient eloquence. The United States has always considered the Latin American Continent as a field for the advantageous investment of capital, an inexhaustible source of raw material, and an important strategic rear guard. Washington cuts all the Latin American peoples' attempts to conquer their authentic independence and to free themselves from the oppression of the foreign monopolies with blood and fire. The semicolonial statute is the [word indistinct] that the strategists of the U.S. policy toward Latin America prepare for that continent.

The history of the relations between the United States and Latin America is the history of interventions, military coups, economic blockades, shameless interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, blackmail, threats and military pressure. This is history, and this is also present day reality. The United States has unconditionally supported Great Britain against Argentina, which wanted to restore its sovereignty over the Malvinas/Falkland Islands, grabbed by the English 1 and 1/2 centuries ago. The United States has adopted this position not in compliance with its duties as ally but in the hope to receive a military base on the oil-rich archipelago.

Through its puppets, the United States is attempting to repress the Salvadoran patriotic forces. The same thing happens in Guatemala, where the United States supports the dictatorship which is waging a true war of destruction against its own countrymen.

The U.S. maneuvers Ocean Venture-82, held in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Caribbean, have recently ended. The maneuvers' goal -- clearly put by the U.S. newspapers -- was not only to exercise pressure on Cuba and Nicaragua but also to develop methods for intervention in Latin American countries, where events not to the liking of the United States may happen.

'Double-Dealing Nature'

PY070037 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2300 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Nikolay Morev commentary]

[Text] The military conflict in the South Atlantic has gone beyond the limits of the British-Argentine bilateral confrontation, therefore it is very difficult to foresee the political consequences of the Malvinas conflict in the long-term. However, it is undeniable that the U.S. pro-British position in this conflict has inflicted a harsh blow on the inter-American system.

Latin American countries are reviewing the U.S. role in regional affairs. There are ever louder voices in favor of the establishment of an exclusively Latin American organization without the participation of the United States, since Washington has clearly shown that in a conflict between OAS and NATO countries, it supports the latter. It is precisely this fact that has compelled many Latin Americans to think about the true U.S. attitude regarding the OAS and other inter-American organizations.

Reviewing the recent 20th OAS Foreign Ministers Consultative Conference, in which Reagan's Latin American policy was harshly criticized, several Latin American observers have expressed their concern over this situation. According to such observers, the war in the South Atlantic jeopardizes U.S. Government plans to establish the so-called inter-American front for the struggle against the infiltration of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

We must note that upon assuming power, the Reagan administration, through its propaganda, began to impinge upon international public opinion the idea that all international problems are the result of the West-East confrontation. By so doing, that administration was automatically denying the right of nations to struggle for their sovereignty and social development, as well as their right to oppose colonialism and neocolonialism to safeguard their freedom and true independence.

All the implications of such propaganda were clearly brought to light in Central America where the United States set itself against the liberation movement in El Salvador and the popular democratic systems in Nicaragua and Grenada counting on alliances with Pinochet, Stroessner, Duvalier, the reactionary dictatorships of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and other military regimes. When the time came for Washington to pronounce itself against a real, not an imaginary aggression, the Reagan government made a 180 degrees turn in its policy and threw its support for the colonialist pretension of Great Britain in the South Atlantic.

It thus became obvious that the repeated declarations of U.S. loyalty to and solidarity with the inter-American system were merely propaganda utterances for the purpose of camouflaging the real U.S. objectives in the region. These objectives are aimed at maintaining the Latin American sources of raw material and cheap labor, as well as at securing the support of dictatorial regimes which practice terror and oppression as a method to silence dissent. Such objectives are pursued under the pretext of fighting communism within the inter-American system by attracting Latin America to the U.S. aggressive plans, discrediting the liberation and democratic movements in the region, and demonstrating to all developing countries around the world the U.S. determination not to tolerate changes that are not in line with U.S. wishes.

The events in Guatemala in 1954, in the Dominican Republic in 1965, the attempts to mobilize the OAS against the Sandinistas in 1979, and the posture adopted in the Malvinas conflict have unmasked the double-dealing nature of Washington's policy toward its neighbors to the south. The political history of Latin America shows that problems in the countries of the continent, as a rule, spring up not with the East but with the neighbour to the north; and the events in the South Atlantic are an eloquent demonstration of that assertion.

PUSTOV EXAMINES 'WAR IN THE SOUTH ATLANTIC'

PM041113 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 May 82 p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA international observer V. Pustov "Military-Political Review": "War in the South Atlantic"]

[Text] When he was preparing for the operation to seize the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Rear Admiral Woodward, commander of the British Expeditionary Corps in the South Atlantic, said it would be a "walkover." Now, 10 days after British landing forces invaded East Falkland (Soledad Island), the boastful promise is no longer recalled. There has been no "walkover." Fierce fighting is underway. Although London is still issuing threats against Argentina, it is at the same time lowering flags to half-mast in token of mourning for the British ships that have been sunk and the sailors who have been killed. The material losses and loss of life sustained in the name of restoring the colonial status of the Falklands (Malvinas) are being totaled up. According to America's CBS TV, Britain's loss of two modern destroyers, two equally modern frigates and a large transport ship has cost it \$1.8 billion.

Over 5,000 British troops are occupying a bridgehead around the port of San Carlos at the northwest tip of the island. Representatives of the British command note that the main danger to the disembarked troops is Argentine aviation. An air defense system, which includes British air defense missile subunits transferred from the FRG, has been hastily set up to combat it and an airstrip is being constructed. Ground defenses are being organized and 105 mm guns, 81 mm mortars and mine and wire obstacles have been installed for the purpose. The British also have tanks and armored personnel carriers.

American military deliveries to Britain, including modern antiaircraft and other missiles, mortars and ammunition, have increased considerably in the last few days. For instance, U.S. Air Force C-141 military transports are intensively transferring military freight directly from U.S. territory to Ascension Island, where the American military base widely used by the British command is located. In the last 3 days alone American planes have delivered around 300 tons of military freight destined for the British Expeditionary Corps.

In the opinion of foreign commentators, the American aid is promoting the sharp intensification of the British landing forces' operations. A considerable part of the forces, supported by tanks, has begun advancing from the San Carlos region in a number of directions, including toward the administrative center of the islands, Port Stanley (Puerto Argentino), where the main force of Argentine troops is (according to foreign press data, up to 7,500 men are concentrated there). In order to storm the administrative center, the British interventionists will have to cross 80 km of difficult stony and boggy terrain, which, British military specialists have noted, "is fraught with [the threat of] great losses" in the event of opposition from Argentine aviation.

According to London's THE TIMES, the Thatcher Cabinet is pressing ahead with the seizure of the islands in the fear that further losses in the conflict would sharply change the mood in the country and undermine the conservatives' position. So, along with a further buildup of forces on the bridgehead that has already been seized, it is expected that a 3,000-strong British force will land near Port Stanley to take part in operations to seize it. Thus in the South Atlantic Britain is launching its biggest aggressive action since the Anglo-French military adventure in the Suez Canal region, which ended ignominiously in 1956.

NATO politicians and strategists and the bourgeois press are analyzing the correlation of forces and making forecasts about the likely outcome of the armed conflict, predicting a victory for Britain. What is being highlighted here is factors such as the extensive aid from the United States and the economic and political support for the aggressor from a number of other North Atlantic bloc countries. Indeed, by relying on Atlantic "solidarity," London was able to concentrate in the South Atlantic a naval armada (including two aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines) considerably superior in strength and combat qualities to the Argentine Navy. According to official data alone, the squadron has over 100 warships and auxiliaries. Further reinforcements are arriving almost daily to help it.

The most vulnerable aspect of the British Expeditionary Corps is its great distance from the mother country -- around 8,000 miles. But even this shortcoming is to a considerable extent compensated for by the active use of the American military base on Ascension Island, 3,000 miles from the combat zone, for the transfer of armed forces. Moreover, reports have appeared in the press of services rendered to London by the fascist regime in Chile and the racist regime in the Republic of South Africa. British helicopters are being assembled in Chile and then ferried to the region of the Falklands (Malvinas). Preparations are underway in South African ports to receive and repair British ships damaged in the fighting and a hospital is getting ready to treat wounded British servicemen. Western military specialists believe that the ice-free port on the island of South Georgia, which was captured earlier and is 900 miles from the combat zone, may also serve as a base for British ships.

Finally, the experience gained by the British "Tommies" not only in the numerous national and NATO military exercises but also in the punitive expeditions mounted in the not-so-very-distant past against national liberation forces in the former colonial possessions is also being noted. As for the Argentine Armed Forces, they have practically not fought at all in the last century, which, Western military analysts believe, is bound to affect their combat capability.

Nonetheless, recently many foreign observers have been increasingly inclining to the opinion that unless the conflict is settled by peaceful means, it will inevitably be protracted, by no means only because of the deteriorating stormy weather, which is hampering operations by ships and aviation. A certain reassessment of Argentina's military potential is taking place. "American officers who formerly served in the Argentine forces as instructors," the New York TIMES writes, "believe that the British have underestimated the Argentine troops' combat capability." An analysis prepared by a group of Spanish military specialists and published by the paper EL PAIS emphasizes that the Argentine garrison in the Falklands (Malvinas) has enough time to create strong defensive installations; a quantity of arms and ammunition that ought to be sufficient for 6 months' fighting has been shipped onto the islands; personnel have been trained in military operations in cold and windy winter conditions.

And the main point is Argentina's air supremacy, which remains despite the losses sustained by its aviation and despite the fact that the Argentine planes, people in the West note, are inferior to the British in firepower. The foreign press is noting that so far naval aircraft have taken the most active part in raids on the British ships. In the future, the New York TIMES predicts, the Argentine Air Force will probably be assigned the decisive role in the fighting.

Before the start of the conflict the Argentine Air Force had over 230 aircraft, including Canberra bombers, Super Etendard and Mirage fighter-bombers and a great number of ground-attack aircraft. Although the British command is not now providing precise figures for the number of aircraft operating in the South Atlantic, it is generally believed that the number cannot be compared with the Argentine air strength. "Argentina," the Washington POST writes in this connection, "has been a very serious adversary for Britain."

Just how far the British Tories intend to go in their attempts to retain one of the last fragments of the former colonial empire can also be judged from the fact that there are nuclear weapons on board ships in the British squadron, which has become public knowledge. The Washington POST points out that "the commander of the task force is authorized to use these weapons in the event of 'serious circumstances'" and therefore, the paper emphasizes, there is a danger that a "little war" may develop into a nuclear war. West Germany's DER SPIEGEL magazine reports that, in the opinion of "Pentagon observers," such a "circumstance" may be merely "a threat of the destruction of the British fleet" as a result of massive attacks by the Argentine Air Force.

London's gamble on armed force is being bolstered not only by nuclear blackmail but also by thinly veiled threats from the leading power in the NATO bloc. Analyzing the possible consequences of the conflict, the well-informed American observer J. Reston openly declares in the New York TIMES that "the United States will not remain on the sidelines and allow the British forces to be routed." Plenty of specific facts regarding the American support for London's imperial ambitions and assistance to the British Expeditionary Corps have been cited in the press. They all provide graphic evidence that Washington is not the last to bear responsibility for the military operations unleashed against Argentina by Britain and for the creation of a threat to international peace and security.

As the TASS statement stresses, Soviet leading circles condemn Britain's use of military force. The bloodshed must be ended immediately.

ARMS SALES SERVE U.S. 'IMPERIAL AMBITION'

LD281700 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 28 May 82

["USA: Increasing Arms Exports" -- TASS headline; by TASS commentator Vyacheslav Muravyov]

[Text] Moscow, 28 May, TASS -- The United States intends to continue to be the world's largest supplier of armaments. This is clear from a draft bill of a programme for American aid to foreign states in fiscal 1983. On Thursday, the draft bill was approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The largest sum are earmarked for increased military aid to the most reactionary and repressive regimes. Military aid is one component of the U.S. administration's line to increase arms exports whose total worth will run into 30 billion dollars this year. This will amount to almost a half of the value of all the U.S. arms exports in the last ten years.

This leap is a direct corollary of the course of the U.S. administration which regards arms exports as an "integral component" of foreign policy. It is therefore no surprise that the list of recipients of weapons "made in USA" is topped by Israel which serves as a proxy for the USA to broaden its military-political presence in the Middle East, and Pakistan, which "has given refuge" to a gang of terrorists with the help of which Washington and Beijing are waging an undeclared war against democratic Afghanistan.

The list also includes El Salvador and Chile which are loyal defenders of U.S. interests in Latin America.

The USA is also supplying weapons to other states. But this "aid" means that these countries find themselves drawn into the orbit of the aggressive U.S. policy. By way of an example one can mention Washington's military aid to Somalia, Oman and other states. Finding themselves in the grip of that "aid" those countries had to yield to U.S. pressure and to agree to station U.S. military bases in their territory.

In drawing developing nations into the costly arms race, the USA above all, works for the attainment of its own imperial ambitions.

U.S. NOT WILLING TO RENEW AGREEMENTS WITH USSR

LD011718 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 1 Jun 82

[Text] Washington, 1 Jun, TASS -- A number of agreements on cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in such spheres as the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space, medicine and health services, science and technology, energetics was signed in 1972-1974. The term of their operation has either expired or is about to expire. But unlike in the previous years, the U.S. administration is now manifesting not the slightest wish to resume these agreements. By this it disrupts relations between the two countries that are based on the principles of cooperation, strikes the blow at everything positive that has been achieved in the past as a result of great efforts.

The administration is deeply mistaken if it proceeds from the premise often advanced in the U.S. official circles that this cooperation, allegedly, is of advantage only to the Soviet Union. This, specifically, is well understood in the U.S. scientific circles. A report published recently by the United States' National Science Foundation points to the importance of the contribution of Soviet specialists to the solution of complex problems of science and technology and stresses that American scientists can learn much from Soviet colleagues.

In other words, bilateral cooperation is equally profitable for the Soviet Union and the United States. As to the damage caused by curtailing this cooperation on purpose, it might turn out to be even greater for the United States than for the Soviet Union.

RPP ON PAKISTANI ACTIVITY IN BORDER AREA

LD032058 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English to Asia 1300 GMT 31 May 82

[Text] The Indian police have arrested a group of Pakistani terrorists in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. According to the newspaper STATESMAN, the bandits committed several murders, over a dozen robberies and other crimes.

The Pakistan special services are systematically infiltrating their agents into the bordering areas of Jammu and Kashmir, trying to destabilize the situation in this Indian state. At the same time, Islamabad is undertaking attempts to legalize Pakistan's occupation of a part of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Thus at the beginning of May, General Ziaul Haq announced his decision to spread the action of some Pakistani laws to the occupied territory and to give it the status of Pakistan's administrative (?unit). Earlier, the Islamabad authorities appointed three observers from the occupied areas to the Federal Consultative Council created by Ziaul Haq.

The head of the Pakistani military regime has also announced the annexation of the areas of Gilgit, Skardu and Hunza, situated on this territory, and his refusal to discuss the Kashmir question with India. These actions have aroused resolute protests of the Indian Government. The occupied part of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir is assigned an important role in the Islamabad regime's military plans. A greater number of border incidents incited by the Pakistani side are taking place there. More and more units of Chinese forces are being deployed near Gilgit. The Indian public has all grounds to believe that Jammu and Kashmir can be used as a stronghold for attacking India, and such a possibility is quite real. It is no coincidence that lately reports about fresh provocations of the Pakistani side, regular military maneuvers, about the construction of aerodromes and strategic highways, the dispatch of Pakistani units of military equivalent are frequently coming from the Indian-Pakistani border area.

According to the PRESS TRUST OF INDIA, Pakistan is boosting its military potential all along the Indian border. Over 350,000 soldiers and officers in 15 infantry and 2 armored tank divisions and powerful artillery forces are amassed there now. At a press conference in Delhi, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi declared that even without the promised F-16 fighter bombers, the Pakistani Air Force already avails of a strike force numerically surpassing the Indian strike force.

The anti-Indian campaign is not reducing but increasing on the pages of the Pakistani press. Certainly it is encouraged and guided by the Pakistani official circles. In spite of the frequent statements about their wish to live in peace with neighbors, particularly with India, the scope and nature of this propagandistic campaign unleashed against India are unprecedented. India is accused of allegedly unleashing a cold war against Pakistan, and of almost preparing a military blow on it, wishing to establish its hegemony in this region. The Pakistani press is daily talking about persecutions and assassinations of Muslims in India. According to the Lahore weekly VIEWPOINT, the anti-Indian campaign in Pakistan has become an almost hysterical nature. In the light of all these events, the actions undertaken by Islamabad in the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, and on its occupied part, do not look so innocent as the Pakistani military regime tries to present them. They provide fresh evidence that the Islamabad authorities, ignoring history, are conducting a dangerous foreign policy which can result in grave consequences for the peoples of Pakistan, as well as of other countries in that region.

INDIAN MINISTER PRAISES OIL PROTOCOL WITH USSR

LD062216 Moscow TASS in English 2124 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun, TASS -- A protocol providing for the broadening of Soviet-Indian cooperation in prospecting for and producing oil has become a major step forward in India's efforts to attain self-sufficiency in oil, a TASS correspondent was told by Shiv Shankar, India's minister of petroleum, chemicals and fertilizers.

The minister ended his week-long visit to the Soviet Union. He has had talks with Nikolay Maltsev Maltsev, minister of the oil industry of the USSR.

The Indian minister stressed that the protocol made a valuable contribution to the realization of the agreement on economic and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of India signed by Leonid Brezhnev and Indira Gandhi in 1980.

The minister said that the sides had agreed to brisk up contacts in the field of prospecting for and producing oil in India, in transferring advanced Soviet technology to India, in training Indian personnel, exchanging scientific information and the delivery of equipment.

India is trying to develop its oil industry, and the Soviet-Indian protocol will to a large extent promote this process, the Indian minister said.

Shiv Shankar visited Tataria, one of the Soviet Union's oldest oil-producing regions, where he familiarised himself with the technology of oil extraction, and visited research and development institutions. He said that his strongest impression from the visit to Soviet Tataria was the remarkable enthusiasm and selflessness with which Soviet oilmen were working, conscious of the fact that their effort made their country stronger and promoted the progress of its industry.

During the visit the minister had meetings with First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Ivan Arkhipov, and Chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations of the USSR Semen Skachkov.

PAPER CARRIES PHOTO OF TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

PM041427 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 28 May carries on page one photograph entitled "On Afghanistan's Soil," which shows "Guard's Ensign N. Gandzyuk," commander of an antitank-machinegun platoon, who is surrounded by six helmeted Soviet soldiers. The caption of the photograph reads in full as follows:

"The servicemen of the antitank-machinegun platoon commanded by Guard's Ensign N. Gandzyuk, who has been awarded the medal 'For Valor,' has achieved high marks in combat and political training. A recent tactical exercise was a difficult test of combat maturity for the guardsmen. Under conditions of a complex combat situation, the servicemen operated to full capacity. The subunit coped with the set task under difficult mountain conditions."

USSR, DRA SIGN CULTURAL, SCIENTIFIC ACCORD

LD021900 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 2 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jun, TASS -- A programme of cultural and scientific cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in 1982-1983 provides for the further development and deepening of contacts in these fields. It was signed here today by Deputy Minister of Culture of the USSR Anatoliy Kovalev and the DRA Ambassador in the USSR Habib Mangal. This agreement is a new example of friendship and cooperation between the two countries in the field of science, culture, education, radio, television, public health and sport.

The expansion of cooperation with the USSR is a noticeable factor of the development of the DRA's science and culture, a TASS correspondent was told by Ambassador Habib Mangal.

In particular, he noted, the programme provides for Soviet assistance to the training of national personnel for us. At present several thousand students and trainees from Afghanistan are attending Soviet establishments of higher and secondary specialised education. Soviet specialists will continue to teach at the university and polytechnical institute in Kabul and at other educational establishments in the DRA, the ambassador went on.

In addition to this, Habib Mangal continued, this document provides for an expansion of exchanges of art collectives, delegations of cultural figures. A new impetus will be given to relations between creative associations of the two countries, to cooperation of the mass media.

U.S., PRC AGGRAVATE TENSIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

LD031650 Moscow in English to South and Southeast Asia 1400 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Text] The Soviet president, Leonid Brezhnev, and the Vietnamese leader, Le Duan, at their meeting in the Kremlin on Monday focused their discussions on the situation in Southeast Asia, which continues to be plagued by tensions. The Soviet side expressed full support for the efforts of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea aimed at resolving the local disputes by means of talks.

Southeast Asia houses two groups of states with different social systems, the Indochinese countries -- Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea -- have embarked on the road of building a new socialist society. Their nearest neighbors are members of ASEAN. Relations between the two groups are marked by a number of unresolved problems. The best and the surest way to solve these problems lies, as the experience of international life has shown, in a direct and constructive dialogue. In the past few years Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea have repeatedly urged the ASEAN members to hold regional consultations for discussing the pressing issues. Possibilities for such discussions exist.

The trouble is that the source of regional tensions lies not in the differences between the Indochina and ASEAN countries, but in attempts on the part of certain forces to use these differences for pursuing their own unseemly ends. These forces are Beijing and Washington, which openly provoke confrontation between the two groups of nations by purposefully aggravating tension among them. With this aim in view, they have been harping of late on the so-called Kampuchean question, invented for camouflaging their interference in Kampuchea's internal affairs. This issue has even been mentioned at the talks held by China's premier, Zhao Ziyang, in Tokyo. According to news reports, consultations relating to the abortive attempts to create a trilateral coalition in Kampuchea also involve Senator Baker of the United States, who arrived in Beijing recently as President Reagan's personal envoy.

All this leaves no doubt as to the fact that Washington and Beijing closely coordinate their plans for anti-Kampuchean subversion. It is noteworthy that the ASEAN countries view these plots with increasing mistrust and concern. The newspaper *INDONESIAN TIMES* has said the attempts to knock together the so-called coalition between Khmer groupings are not only useless but also harmful, because they are used by China for the purpose of aggravating tension in the region and pressing its minions on the Kampuchean people. An Indonesian political figure, Ruslan Abdulgani, in an interview for the magazine *TOPIC*, has said it is necessary to avoid confrontation with the Indochina countries in order to thwart Beijing's schemes aimed at turning Southeast Asia into its patrimony.

These statements reflect the growing trend towards starting a dialogue with Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. ASEAN members believe that such a dialogue would contribute to an improvement in the situation in the region and to the establishment of a zone of peace and stability there. As for the Soviet Union, it has always supported all initiatives prompted by concern about ASEAN security. The Soviet Union, said President Brezhnev at his meeting with Le Duan in Moscow, would like to see Southeast Asia a zone of peace and stability. This would promote the interests of the local nations and of the world at large.

U.S. PROMOTES MILITARY BUILDUP IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

LD031708 Moscow in English to South and Southeast Asia 1400 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Victor Vladimirov commentary]

[Text] International news agencies report that large-scale naval maneuvers are being held in Southeast Asia in the first half of June. The naval forces of Thailand and the United States are holding joint exercises in the Gulf of Siam, and in the South China Sea warships and aircraft of five countries -- Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand and Britain -- are being drilled in waging a sea battle.

Analysts in Asia feel maneuvers of this kind are in keeping with Washington's policy of dragging the ASEAN nations into the American military preparations in the region. On the pretext of ensuring the so-called vital interests of the United States thousands of miles away from the American shores, these military preparations are growing in scale.

The commander of the United States Pacific forces, including those in Southeast Asia, has an impressive armed fist. Adm Robert Long has 315,000 officers and men, 130 large surface and underwater vessels and hundreds of combat aircraft. Mind, the Reagan administration is not only building up the quantity of troops; Admiral Long says the American forces in the region will be equipped with cruise missiles that can carry nuclear or binary charges. Under the program of stepping up its military might, the United States expects to reinforce and expand the network of bases in Southeast Asia, namely in Japan, the Philippines, Korea and Australia. The Pentagon has virtually activated some bases in Thailand and has moved servicemen and military hardware there.

All this shows that in its strategic plans for Southeast Asia the Pentagon attaches a great role to the ASEAN nations, hoping to make them participate in United States military adventures. The five-nation ASEAN is persuaded to build up arms. The FINANCIAL TIMES of London says that on the Pentagon's prodding the ASEAN nations have in recent years more than doubled their spending on purchases of weapons from other countries, first of all from the United States. Nevertheless, by 1985 the ASEAN nations are to have again doubled purchases of American arms.

Judging by the draft federal budget for the 1983 fiscal year published in Washington, the United States will augment aid to the ASEAN nations. Most of the sums will go to buy American weapons and military equipment. Washington is using arms shipments as a lever of pressure to turn ASEAN into a military alliance. When the United States secretary of state, Alexander Haig, attended the Manila meeting of Asian foreign ministers a year ago, he gave it to understand that the Reagan administration viewed ASEAN as a military and political ally. It is obvious that Washington intends to build its relations with ASEAN on the pattern of its ties with NATO. When United States officials discuss a policy of this kind, they underscore the need for keeping at a high level the combat ability of ASEAN in general and of every ASEAN member, in particular. Characteristically Washington's energetic military preparations in Southeast Asia and its attempts to involve the ASEAN nations have the backing of Beijing. This is proof that Washington and Beijing are coordinating their actions.

The Hong Kong weekly FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW remarks that such actions are likely to further heighten tensions in Southeast Asia. What is more, they may lead to more conflicts.

USSR, SRV OFFICIALS CONSULT ON UNGA SESSION

PM071037 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report from "The World Today" feature compiled by M. Zubko: "Consultations at the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] Soviet-Vietnamese consultations were held at the USSR Foreign Ministry on 27 May on questions of the forthcoming UN General Assembly session on disarmament and several other questions of mutual interest. Taking part in the consultations on the Vietnamese side were Vo Dong Giang, SRV deputy foreign minister; Vo Anh Tuan, ambassador for special assignments; and Pham (Ngak), acting SRV Foreign Ministry department chief; and on the Soviet side V.F. Petrovskiy, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry collegium; S.A. Bogomolov, USSR Foreign Ministry administration chief; I.A. Rogachev, USSR Foreign Ministry department chief; and other officials of the two countries' Foreign Ministries.

G.M. Korniyenko, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received Vo Dong Giang and had a talk with him, which passed in a warm, comradely atmosphere.

HUSAK OFFICIAL VISIT CONCLUDES 4 JUN

Soviet-CSSR Communique

PM071011 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 82 pp 1, 4

[Text] A CSSR party and government delegation headed by G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR, was in the Soviet Union 1 through 4 June 1982 on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers. During the visit meetings and talks took place between the CSSR party and government delegation and a USSR party and government delegation headed by L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The delegations were as follows:

The Soviet delegation -- N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; K.U. Chernenko, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; K.V. Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and A.P. Botvin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the CSSR;

The Czechoslovak delegation -- Lubomir Strougal, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and premier of the CSSR Government; Vasil Bilak, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee; Alois Indra, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and chairman of the CSSR Federal Assembly; Josef Korcak, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and premier of the Czech Socialist Republic Government; Josef Lenart, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and first secretary of the Communist Party of Slovakia Central Committee, and Cestmir Lovetsinsky, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and CSSR ambassador to the USSR.

Key questions of further developing Soviet-Czechoslovak relations and deepening all-around cooperation between the CPSU and the CPCZ and the USSR and the CSSR, and also topical problems of the international situation and the communist and workers movement were discussed in a spirit of fraternal unity and full mutual understanding, in an atmosphere of comradely cordiality.

Leonid Brezhnev reported on the activity of the CPSU and of the Soviet people in implementing the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress, and the basic tasks of the economic and social development of Soviet society. The May plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee which discussed and approved the Food Program of the Soviet Union for the period up to 1990, the 17th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions and the 19th Congress of the All-Union Leninist Communist Union of Youth were particularly emphasized as events of great social and political importance. They all became a strong stimulus for the working and political activity of Soviet people. They demonstrated the complete support which the Soviet people gives to the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU.

As a token of the victory of the Leninist nationalities policy and historic successes of socialism, the Soviet people welcome the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

Gustav Husak reported on the progress of the struggle of the CPCZ and the Czechoslovak working people to achieve the targets set out by the 16th CPCZ Congress aimed at building an advanced socialist society. It was stressed that the CPCZ is successfully implementing its guiding role in society, and in consolidating its link with the masses. Characteristic of the social atmosphere of Czechoslovakia is political stability, the activity of the working class, peasants and intelligentsia, which are ensuring the development of the national economy and growth in the spiritual potential of the country.

Both sides noted with deep satisfaction that relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are based on the life-giving principles of Marxism-Leninism and of socialist internationalism, on the firm basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The proven friendship and cooperation of the fraternal parties, states and nations reached a new level over the past period. In this connection great significance was stressed for agreements reached during the friendly visit of the Soviet party and governmental delegation to Czechoslovakia, and also during the subsequent meetings between Leonid Brezhnev and Gustav Husak.

Both sides particularly stressed that in the ideological and political sphere the unity of opinions on all fundamental questions has become even firmer. The coordination activity of the two parties has become richer, operational comradely cooperation continues, cooperation between ideological and scientific institutions, mass information media, trade unions, young peoples' and other working people's social organizations has become active. Direct links are being consolidated between Soviet and Czechoslovak work collectives and creative unions. Mutual acquaintance among Soviet and Czechoslovak working people of the cultural successes of both countries is becoming increasingly more extensive. Both sides, which highly praised everything which was achieved, expressed firm determination to continue to consolidate the joint struggle of Soviet and Czechoslovak Communists, the friendship between the working people in both countries, to continue to develop everything good that was achieved during the process of fraternal cooperation.

The Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic agree that the dynamic planned development and deepening of their economic cooperation is an important factor in the progress of each party, and serves the interests of raising the standard of living of the Soviet and Czechoslovak people. Among other things stressed was the great importance of the constant growth of Soviet-Czechoslovak goods exchange, which during the present 5-year plan is increasing more than 1 and 1/2 times in comparison with the last 5-year plan.

An integral part of the practice of the national economic activity of both countries is the linking of material and labor resources aimed at creating future production complexes, at harnessing and rationally exploiting natural wealth, and at the implementation of the long-term -- up to 1990 -- specified program of development of specialization and cooperation which involves many industrial branches of both countries.

Both sides believe that new horizons of Soviet-Czechoslovak economic cooperation will be revealed along the paths of further deepening the division of labor, of joint development and introduction of progressive scientific, technical and production programs, the establishment of direct contacts between ministries, associations and enterprises, and the creation of joint firms.

Mention was made of the need to concentrate the joint effort of both sides on those areas which condition modern technical development such as the production of equipment which saves energy, and modern electronic equipment including microprocessors, industrial robots, and machine tools with programmed control. Both sides see great potential for the development of economic links in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic's participation in the modernization and expansion of Soviet enterprises in light and food-processing industries and in trade and services for the public. It was stressed that the shift of the national economy both of the Soviet Union and of Czechoslovakia to intensive development calls for the further improvement of the economic mechanism on the basis of making it comply more closely with all economic laws of socialism, on the basis of a new approach in the management of social production, increasing the level of management of economic activity, the further development of social activity of the working people, the expansion of their immediate participation in solving the most important social and economic problems.

Both sides expressed themselves in favor of expanding mutual collaboration in those issues also so that every socialist country actively uses its collective experience for everything that is best in the implementation of socialist economic practice.

In this connection the conviction was expressed that the socialist community, with its immense economy, its great scientific and technical potential, highly-qualified cadres and rich natural resources, has everything necessary for the successful solution of social and economic tasks, no matter how complicated. The coming economic consultative session of member countries of CEMA at the highest level, the preparation of which both sides are devoting great attention, is to contribute to the maximum exploitation of this potential for joint interests.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will further facilitate in every way the consolidation of the unity and cohesion of the socialist community. This fundamental factor of preserving peace will contribute to the strengthening of the military-political defensive alliance of Warsaw Treaty member states which reliably guarantees the socialist gains and creative work of the peoples of the fraternal countries, ensures the coordination of actions to implement their agreed-upon foreign policy course in questions of European and international security.

They resolutely condemn the hostile actions by imperialist circles, the attempts at interference in internal affairs and all sorts of discriminatory measures against the Polish People's Republic and other socialist countries. The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have given and will give every support to socialist Poland, their friend and ally, in overcoming the existing difficulties.

Both sides hold that the drastic invigoration of the militaristic policy of the NATO bloc, and first of all of the United States of America, their launching of a new, extremely dangerous round of the arms race in the striving to disrupt the obtained strategic balance and to secure military superiority for themselves necessitate a resolute intensification of struggle by all the peaceloving forces, states and peoples against the growing threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are convinced that at present no foreign policy task is more important and urgent.

In this connection the Czechoslovak side highly assessed the new peace initiatives of the CPSU, the Soviet State, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet L.I. Brezhnev directed at eliminating the danger of nuclear war, continuing the policy of detente, strengthening peace and ensuring the safe future of the peoples. Czechoslovakia will facilitate the implementation of these initiatives.

The Soviet side stressed the important positive significance of the contribution made to the common efforts of the fraternal countries to strengthen peace by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPCZ, President of Czechoslovakia Gustav Husak.

Together with other socialist states, together with the great majority of countries of the world the USSR and Czechoslovakia resolutely come out against attempts to impose confrontation, to violate normal relations between countries, to flout the sovereign rights of peoples upholding their freedom and independence. They regard as especially dangerous the concepts set forth by the United States of the admissibility and even acceptability of nuclear war, of the justification to be the first to use nuclear arms in the fulfillment of various adventurist plans.

The sides are convinced that in these conditions the adoption by all nuclear powers of the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear arms would be of key importance in these conditions for eliminating the danger of nuclear war. They see in this the direct duty of nuclear powers, their responsibility to mankind.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia again stressed the pressing need of real advance in the cause of curbing the race of armaments, especially nuclear ones. The two sides firmly declared for the resumption of Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms, for removing the impasse and bringing to a successful conclusion the talks on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the liquidation of their stockpiles, on strengthening the guarantees to non-nuclear countries and on other aspects of ending the arms race and of disarmament.

They also declared for the speediest commencement of talks on the prohibition of the placing of any types of weapons in outer space.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia attach much importance to the forthcoming second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. They consider it necessary for the decisions of this major international forum to give an impulse to the resumption and intensification of talks on various aspects of the problem of arms reduction and disarmament. The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will be prepared to cooperate in this direction at the session with all states.

Much attention was given at the talks to the study of the situation forming in Europe. The danger posed to all European peoples by the plans to deploy new American medium-range nuclear weapons in some West European countries was stressed. In this connection the sides stated that they resolutely come out for progress and the attainment of results at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe.

Fully supporting the Soviet Union's constructive positions at these talks, the Czechoslovak side welcomes the steps taken by the USSR unilaterally, in the spirit of good will to help the attainment of a reasonable accord on major reductions of nuclear weapons in the European Continent. It was noted at the same time that the present position of the United States at the talks on this question, directed at the one-sided disarmament of the other side, only further bared the true meaning of the so-called "double track" NATO decision, that is, to conduct talks not for the sake of attaining a just solution based on the principle of equality and equal security but for the sake of justifying and covering up preparations for the deployment in Western Europe of new American medium-range nuclear weapons. The sides expressed hope that the United States and its NATO allies will revise their position and take steps capable of helping to save the European Continent from the danger of nuclear conflagration.

As direct participants in the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia hold that the draft agreement on reduction at the first stage, proposed by Poland on behalf of the socialist countries taking part in the talks, creates a good basis for transition to the working out of a practical accord on this question. Together with the other socialist countries they are awaiting the reply of the Western participants in the talks.

It was also stressed, when views were exchanged on questions of the situation in Europe, that the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia cannot remain indifferent in face of such actions by NATO as the implementation of the long-term program of building up and modernizing armed forces and armaments in Europe, the signing of additional military agreements between the United States and the FRG that increase the scope of their militaristic activities, and Spain's accession to the North Atlantic bloc.

The negative influence was noted on the situation in Europe of the attempts by certain circles in NATO countries to spread confrontation to the sphere of trade, finance, science, technology, culture and other spheres.

The USSR and Czechoslovakia confirmed once again that the future of Europe should be based not on the policy of hatred and of lining up some states against others, but on the consistent fulfillment by all states, parties to the European conference, of all the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act which is rightly regarded by the European peoples as a charter of peace in the continent, a long-term and concrete program of strengthening and deepening detente.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia consistently come out for the continuation of the process started by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. They hold that the Madrid meeting, which will resume this autumn, should end with positive results, the nucleus of which would be agreement on the convocation of a conference on confidence-building measures, on security and disarmament in Europe. For their part, they will do everything necessary for this.

Views were exchanged on the situation in various areas of the world where problems exist creating a threat to peace, to the security and freedom of peoples.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia again expressed fraternal solidarity with socialist Cuba against which American imperialism is not ceasing its campaign of threats. Condemning the U.S. threats against Nicaragua and American interference in El Salvador, they come out for the easing of tension in the area of Central America and the Caribbean on the basis of unconditional respect for the right of peoples to shape their own destiny.

The USSR and Czechoslovakia state that they fully side with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and support the protection of their sovereignty and independence, the normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia, and the turning of that area into a zone of peace and stability.

The sides condemned Britain's military actions against Argentina which create a threat to international peace and security. They are convinced that in present-day conditions any attempts to act by methods of colonialist brigandage inevitably will turn against those who resort to such methods.

It was noted that the situation in the Middle East not only continues to be unstable and tense, but that it is also fraught with the danger of new aggravations of the conflict. The events taking place there clearly confirm that the road of separate deals has nothing in common with the task of establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Such deals only encourage the Israeli aggressors to the further use of force against Arab states and peoples and lead to the acquisition by imperialist forces of a springboard for direct interference in the affairs of the countries of the Middle East and adjacent areas.

The sides stressed that an all-embracing and just settlement in the Middle East must ensure a return to Arab countries of all lands seized from them by Israel in 1967, ensure for the Arab people of Palestine the implementation of its inalienable right to self-determination and creation of its own state and enable all states of the area, Israel included, to live in peace and security. In the opinion of both sides the only road to such a peace is the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East in accordance with the USSR's proposal.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia resolutely condemned the aggressive actions of the South African racists against the People's Republic of Angola and declared for the speediest, just solution of the Namibian problem on the basis of the full implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

When views were exchanged on topical questions of the international communist and workers' movement it was stressed by both sides that the CPSU and the CPCZ are doing and will be doing everything for the strengthening of solidarity and cooperation with their foreign class brothers, to facilitate the close cohesion of the communist movement on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism.

In the course of the visit the Czechoslovak party and governmental delegation placed a wreath on the mausoleum of Vladimir Ilich Lenin and on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The delegation also visited Ulyanovsk where it inspected Lenin's monument, the museum and other places linked with the life and activity of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. The delegation visited the Ulyanovsk automobile production plant, had a meeting with the working people and leading officials of the oblast and town, with scientific and cultural workers and with representatives of social organizations. Everywhere the Czechoslovak guests were received sincerely and heartily in the spirit of fraternal friendship which characterizes the relations between the Soviet and Czechoslovak peoples.

The Czechoslovak delegation expressed sincere thanks to the CPSU Central Committee, to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and to the Soviet Government for the fact that it was able to learn about the life of the Soviet people, about its success in building communism.

Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, on behalf of the CPCZ Central Committee and the Czechoslovak Government, invited Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to visit the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at the head of a Soviet party and government delegation at a time which would suit him. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Rusakov Sees Off Delegation

LD042000 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] The Czechoslovak party and government delegation led by Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the republic, which has been staying in Ulyanovsk, today visited places associated with the life of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. The guests laid a wreath at the memorial to servicemen from Ulyanovsk who fell during the Great Patriotic War. The Ulyanovsk Obkom and the obispolkom gave a luncheon in honor of the delegation.

The delegation has left for home. It was seen off at the airport by Comrade Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

Telegram From Airplane

LD041454 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun, TASS -- Members of the party and government delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have sent a telegram to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

"It is with deep impressions that we are leaving the territory of the Soviet Union after the successful completion of our official friendly visit", says the telegram sent by the members of the Czechoslovak party and government delegation to the CPSU Central Committee from board plane. It expresses gratitude for the warm friendly reception "which confirmed again the sincere friendship that the heroic Soviet people has for our country."

The Czechoslovak-Soviet talks, the telegram says, demonstrated once again the common resolve to deepen and develop comradely relations between the two fraternal parties and states in the interests of building socialism and communism, of the unity and cohesion of the socialist community, the international communist and workers' movement on the tested principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

Biographical Report on Husak

PM041325 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 1 June carries on page 2 a 1,200-word unattributed biography, with photograph, of Czechoslovak party and state leader Gustav Husak linked to his visit to the Soviet Union. In the course of its account of Husak's career, the biography offers the following remarks:

"After the February [1948] victory Comrade Husak held responsible party and state posts. At the Ninth CPCZ Congress in 1949 he was elected a member of the CPCZ Central Committee. In the early fifties, as a result of unsubstantiated accusations, Comrade Husak was relieved of all his posts and arrested. After his rehabilitation in 1963 he engaged in scientific activity and worked within the Slovak Academy of Sciences system. In April 1968 he was appointed deputy premier of the CSSR Government.

"Pursuing a consistent Marxist-Leninist policy, Comrade Husak took an active part in surmounting the profound sociopolitical crisis of 1968-1969. In August 1968 he was elected first secretary of the Communist Party of Slovakia Central Committee. That same year he became a member of the CPCZ Central Committee and of its presidium. "At the 1969 CPCZ Central Committee April plenum, at which a new leadership of the CPCZ was created, Comrade Husak was elected first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

"The new CPCZ leadership headed by Comrade Husak succeeded in rallying all Marxist-Leninist forces in the party, purging its ranks of alien elements, restoring ideological and organizational unity, restoring and deepening the CPCZ's fraternal ties with the CPSU and the other communist and workers parties and strengthening the bonds of friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries."

JARUZELSKI CABLES BREZHNEV FROM PLANE

LD041436 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun, TASS -- The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic Wojciech Jaruzelski sent the following telegram to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev:

"Esteemed Comrade Brezhnev,

"Flying over the territory of the fraternal Soviet Union I convey to you and in your person to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Government of the USSR and the Soviet people sincere wishes of big successes in communist construction, in the struggle for peace and socialism".

TASS REPORTS POLISH-ROMANIAN JOINT COMMUNIQUE

LD051908 Moscow TASS in English 1628 GMT 5 Jun 82

[Text] Bucharest, 5 Jun, TASS -- A joint Romanian-Polish communique has been published here on the results of the official friendly visit to Romania of a party and state delegation from the Polish People's Republic led by Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and chairman of the Council of Ministers of Poland. The delegation's visit was made at the invitation of Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

The communique expresses concern at the aggravation of the international situation as a result of the escalation of the imperialist policy of force, which poses a serious threat to peace and the security of peoples. Poland and Romania reiterated their determination to continue making an active contribution to promoting the cause of detente and ensuring European security and to act at one with other countries, members of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

The communique says that measures adopted by the United States and other NATO countries in imposing an economic and political boycott of Poland and discrimination against socialist countries are in contradiction with the universally accepted norms of international law and the Helsinki Final Act.

Both sides believe that any economic or other measures, interfering in the home affairs of Poland, should be cancelled. During the talks the two sides confirmed their resolve to facilitate greater cooperation within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) in performing the goals set by a comprehensive program and special long-term programs. They noted with satisfaction the favourable development of Romanian-Polish economic relations and said they are bent on continuing to enhance mutually beneficial links, by paying special attention to production cooperation.

REACTION TO VERSAILLES ECONOMIC SUMMIT

Summit Conclusion Reported

LD061818 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Paris, 6 Jun, TASS -- The conference of the leaders of the seven biggest capitalist countries -- the United States, Canada, the FRG, France, Britain, Italy and Japan, that was held in Versailles near Paris, ended here today with the adoption of a concluding declaration.

It follows from the concluding declaration that the participants in the summit have failed to achieve any substantial agreements on any of the questions under discussion. The sharp differences between the United States and its partners on cardinal problems of the economic situation in capitalist countries likewise were not overcome. It was announced here that the next summit of the leaders of the seven capitalist countries will be held in 1983 in the United States.

Sturua Commentary

LD051706 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 5 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jun, (TASS) -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan arrived in Western Europe, Malor Sturua writes in IZVESTIYA today. His tour will last for ten days and its milestones are: to attend the economic summit meeting in Versailles, a session of the NATO Council in Bonn, to meet with the Pope in the Vatican and with Queen Elizabeth II of Great Britain in Buckingham Palace.

"The geographic milestones of Ronald Reagan's tour precisely coincide with political objectives of the President," Malor Sturua writes further. "Analysts in Washington are unanimous in the opinion that there are three of them: to compose economic differences tearing apart the 'Club of Seven' -- major industrialized capitalist nations of the world; to put an end to discord in the North Atlantic bloc; and to give a boost to his personal image in the eyes of the West European public." The article says that "what is referred to as 'settling economic differences' in the parlance of U.S. diplomats means in the languages of the remaining 'six' as a 'an attempt to impose on them the diktat of American monopolies', while 'to put an end to discord' inside NATO means in other languages the Pentagon's desire to make Western Europe march to its militaristic commands."

"Heavy clouds hanging over Bonn perfectly match those that are darkening the sky over Versailles," Malor Sturua writes. "But in this case the matter at hand is the fate of Europe which Washington's aggressive and adventuristic policies threaten to make no stronger than an egg-shell. Nuclear confrontation in Europe has reached a dangerously high level. A real threat of a world fire starting any moment has emerged here once again." "There is no doubt," Malor Sturua writes, "that the economic difficulties experienced by the Western world, specifically by Western Europe, cannot be resolved or even alleviated if the burden of military spending continues to press heavily on the shoulders of NATO countries, if, instead of fruitful cooperation and trade between countries with different social systems, diverse embargoes, sanctions and other accessories of the policy of diktat gain the upper hand."

"The Western European public must and will, in fact, judge about the U.S. President's visit not by the splendour of gala receptions at the palaces of Versailles and Buckingham [Palace], the Vatican and Bonn, but by the fact to what extent its results will prove to come in line with the long-cherished dream of all people -- durable peace on earth, on all of its continents," the author writes in conclusion.

PRAVDA on U.S. Aims

LD061044 Moscow TASS in English 1024 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun, TASS -- "Washington considers it necessary to reaffirm in the face of its allies claims to leadership and, it means, a right to command, dictate and 'punish and pardon'".

This is how today's PRAVDA describes the aims of the U.S. President's trip to Western Europe.

In the opinion of the White House spokesman, PRAVDA recalls, the trip to Western Europe is the most important foreign-policy action by the President since taking office. Thus how the London newspaper THE TIMES wrote. In all probability, this is really so, if taking in at a glance the mountain of problems that have piled up in the West over the past one and a half years alone.

Over the period, the newspaper writes in its International Review, Washington's course towards confrontation, the arms race and towards achieving military superiority has brought on a sharp deterioration of the international situation. Cold-war winds start blowing again; the machine of the arms race has picked up speed. New and new, still more refined methods of mass annihilation of people -- the neutron bomb, binary shells, etc. -- started coming off U.S. assembly lines. And one more thing: None of the U.S. presidents asked Congress such huge sums of money for military purposes as the incumbent one.

The fronts of undeclared wars in which the USA is involved in this or that war -- in the Near and Middle East, in Central America and the South Atlantic -- have broadened.

Maybe, U.S. leadership in the Western world which Washington so insistently claims will facilitate combatting the crisis state which the economy of the West has long been in? PRAVDA asks. No, Reagan's conception -- that of a vigorous free alliance the members of which act jointly have failed to stand the test. The U.S. stand at the Versailles meeting shows that the 'leader' wants to be full master. This is indicated by U.S. attempts to make its partners limit the granting of export credits to socialist countries and by the proposal to reconsider altogether trade-and-economic contacts between West and East with a view to toughening them.

"U.S. partners expected," PRAVDA writes, "that at the Versailles meeting they will manage to compel the United States to go to a change of economic policy and first of all to lower the interest rates as well as barriers in trade. However, actually, the things failed to get going, and the West European participants in the meeting have become convinced that the United States is interested in observing its own benefit and in weakening its main competitors on the world market, even if these are U.S. allies."

Bovin on Trade Ties

LD061730 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 6 Jun 82

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin]

[Excerpts] A topic I wish to talk about today is the conference of the heads of the large capitalist states, which began on Friday in Versailles and closed today. You will have already heard or read about the content of the discussions -- heated discussions -- which developed there. I will remind you of just one moment. Reagan put pressure on West Europe and Japan to embitter and reduce economic cooperation with socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union. The overall picture is that Reagan's pressure failed to arouse any enthusiasm among the other conference participants. Cooperation with the Soviet Union has deep roots in West Europe, it is profitable, it is stable.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Ilyashenko report from London] On opposite sides of the Atlantic Ocean there are different approaches to the development of trade and economic relations between East and West. This has been reflected fairly clearly in the attitude of the West Europeans and Americans to the construction of a new gas pipeline between Siberia and the western border of the USSR. In the coming years it will be able to satisfy part of the needs of West Europe for gas. Washington, as is known, has imposed a ban on the export to the USSR of some types of American equipment, and has demanded that its West European allies impose trade restrictions.

But this pressure has failed to produce the expected results for the Reagan administration. British business circles have clearly rejected Washington's economic war strategy and intend to continue mutually profitable cooperation with our country.

In the present conditions of economic difficulties, British businessmen simply cannot afford to miss the opportunity being opened for them through trade with the Soviet Union. But the interests of British business circles sometimes differ with the official line of London in questions of British-Soviet economic cooperation. The year before last, the Tory government -- taking the road for worsening relations with the USSR -- refused to sign new credit arrangements at intergovernment levels. Restrictions were imposed on the exchange of scientific and technical information. As a result, trade between the two countries fell sharply. In May last year, under pressure of British business circles, the Conservative government took a more realistic position. After a meeting of the Soviet-British Intergovernment Commission, some steps were outlined for improving economic relations. [end recording]

VORONTSOV ARTICLE ON U.S.-W. EUROPEAN RELATIONS

PM041501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 82 p 6

[Dr of Historical Sciences G. Vorontsov article: "United States-West Europe: Crisis of Confidence"]

[Text] American imperialism's increasing aggressiveness combined with the deepening of crisis phenomena in the capitalist system has helped to exacerbate the contradictions on a whole series of political and economic problems between the United States and its European partners.

American strategists believe that the material backup for Washington's imperial ambitions is linked with the more intensive exploitation of its allies' strength and resources. It is not for nothing that the U.S. ruling circles are making a truly unprecedented effort in their desire to make more active use of the international positions and the increased economic and military potential of their partners in West Europe for the pursuit of their hegemonist course. However, under the slogan of "rallying" in the struggle against the "Soviet threat," the United States also wants at the same time to weaken the positions of its West European competitors. To weaken them politically by destroying detente and returning to the Atlantic discipline of the cold war times; to weaken them economically -- in particular with the help of breaking off mutually advantageous business ties between the West and the East of the European Continent and increasing military spending. It is no wonder, therefore, that concern is growing in West European public circles with regard to the self-seeking aims of American policy.

Not so long ago the American magazine U.S. NEWS WORLD REPORT cited a whole "catalog of critical problems" on which Washington cannot count entirely "on the support of its allies." These include the realization of the plans to deploy medium-range missiles in Europe, the policy of "sanctions" against Poland and the USSR, U.S. policy in the Near East, and the attitude toward the liberation movement in Central America. To this one should also add the acute financial and commercial contradictions that exist among the Western partners. The well-known French publicist A. Fontaine recently wrote in an article entitled "Transatlantic Doubts and Dreams" that previously, the disagreements that arose periodically between the United States and West Europe were mostly "put down" to lack of understanding. Such a proliferation of them is to be observed in the eighties that it now enables one to speak of a "crisis of confidence."

Weighty causes of a long-term nature lie behind the exacerbation of disagreements between the United States and West Europe. The NATO military-political bloc, in which the commanding heights are held by Washington, is a very important factor determining in many respects the substance and forms of relations between West Europe and the United States. Never before in the entire centuries-long history of the continent has a single non-European state had on its territory such a huge grouping of troops equipped with the most modern weapons, including nuclear weapons, as the United States is now maintaining there.

Nonetheless, Washington intends to sharply increase its striking power in West Europe by deploying new nuclear missiles there.

It is natural that such a situation is fraught with terrible consequences for West European states, particularly if you take into account the transatlantic strategists' gamble on "limited" nuclear war. West Europeans rightly put the question: "Limited" to what -- the European Continent? "You can deploy whatever weapons you like in West Germany, but they could not defend this country," the eminent West German scientist C.F. von Weizsaecker declared, for example. "We can be defended only by political means such as the preservation of detente and the prevention of cold war."

Indeed, even in the event of the U.S. use of merely tactical nuclear charges in central Europe, as provided for in the American Army instruction FM 101-31, up to 10 million people will die in the FRG, the West German magazine STERN reports..

The growing understanding of the urgent need to remove the threat of nuclear disaster and the realization of the exceptional danger of implementing the U.S. and NATO "missile decisions" have given rise to a strong wave of world public protest. Peace marches, mass demonstrations and collections of signatures for antiwar appeals have embraced all West European states.

The antiwar movement in West Europe has assumed the nature of a strong political force uniting within its ranks people with very different political convictions. It has had to be taken increasingly into account in the NATO countries' seats of government. It is not for nothing that the United States is having to resort to ever-increasing pressure on its partners to make them confirm their consent to the deployment of American missiles.

By all accounts the idea of easing tension and of East-West cooperation has already put down deep roots in the people's masses and in a significant section of ruling circles and many parties in West Europe. The constructive participation of West European states in detente in the seventies helped to stabilize the situation in Europe and strengthen the role of these states in economics and politics not only on a regional scale.

The American policy of undermining all-European cooperation among states with different social systems is quite groundless. It is dictated by the U.S. ruling circles' self-seeking aims. All-European cooperation is a natural process which has evolved over many years and is backed by the traditional economic, political, cultural, scientific and other ties among the continent's states. The artificial division of Europe, as evidenced by the rather lengthy cold war period, certainly did not benefit a single state. And now, clearly contrary to the interests of European states, Washington is trying to revive the cold war spirit and destroy the edifice of detente erected through the joint efforts of all the peoples of Europe.

Of course, we must not forget the class solidarity of representatives of U.S. and West European big business -- which is a constant factor uniting the isolated national detachments of the bourgeoisie within the framework of general imperialist strategy. This (in addition to its own self-seeking interests) accounts, in particular, for the U.S. support for London's imperial ambitions in the present crisis over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. However, all this can no longer hide the fact that the black-and-white tones of the view of the world now characteristic of U.S. foreign policy strategists are being exchanged for a broader spectrum in West European capitals. "Agreement at a strategic level" is no longer capable of reducing all the diverse aspirations of the United States and the West European states to a common "Atlantic denominator."

This is accounted for largely by the change in the correlation of forces in the capitalist world, expressed in the weakening of U.S. positions and the strengthening of West Europe. Suffice it to say that the EEC states' GNP has exceeded the American GNP since 1979. And an economically strengthened West Europe is trying to obtain a voice in the transatlantic choir in keeping with its present strength.

Thus, it has found within itself sufficient strength to rebuff Washington's unprecedented pressure aimed at making West European states abandon the realization of the joint "gas for pipes" project with the USSR. The West Europeans' resistance to the massive U.S. pressure convincingly shows that it is a question of very significant differences of interests on vitally important problems. There is no need to say in detail how much the significance of the availability of raw material resources has increased in the West recently.

By seeking with all its strength to prevent the implementation of the "gas for pipes" project Washington quite definitely wants to strike against detente. Another, less publicized but no less important, aim is the U.S. desire to stave off the trend toward increasing the number of energy sources for West Europe and to keep it dependent on energy suppliers who are to one degree or another under the control of American capital. Washington undoubtedly places its monopolies' mercenary interests above its allies' fundamental economic and political interests.

The economic contradictions between imperialism's American and West European centers have recently been developing into increasingly fierce skirmishes by their monopolies for markets, capital investment spheres and sources of raw materials and energy. The stronger the onslaught from the European competitors, the more desperate the resistance of American capital, which has by no means yet lost its position as the most powerful center of imperialism and its chief economic force.

American capital seeks to exert a substantial influence not only on the West European states' economic life but also on their foreign policy. In addition to direct pressure on governments, American monopolies have repeatedly given support to rightwing circles in West Europe. In Portugal, for example, they once resorted to cutting back production for the purpose of discrediting the revolutionary government's economic policy. Now the United States is seeking to prevent the implementation of the domestic policy of Rance's leftwing majority government by attacking the French franc's positions.

With the Reagan administration's accession to power in the United States the contradictions with its European allies over economic and financial questions were still further exacerbated. The Republicans openly adopted an "aggressive economic policy," seeking to resolve U.S. economic problems at their partners' expense. Washington's egoistic economic and financial policy, particularly the sharp rise in bank rates, is helping to deepen the crisis phenomena in the economies of West European states and resulting in their poorer competitiveness. The West European leaders' repeated requests to the United States to take their countries' interests into consideration, too, have gone unheeded.

Of course, West European states possess considerable potential for counteracting the present U.S. administration's egoistic policy. As many politicians in these countries believe, it is perfectly appropriate to use this potential to influence American plans and decisions.

"Objectively speaking," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev pointed out, "the policy of further inflaming the international atmosphere, escalating the arms race and disrupting normal ties among states augurs nothing good for any people, including, of course, the American people, and it could bring many misfortunes upon all mankind. Therefore we are firmly convinced that such a policy cannot receive the peoples' support and has no future."

PREVIEW OF REAGAN'S WEST BERLIN VISIT

DWO41142 Moscow in German to Germany 1500 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Text] Ten years ago, on 3 June 1972, the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin became effective. Listen to a commentary by Vladimir Ostrogorskiy on this anniversary.

The West Berlin Agreement, a result of the genuine peace policy of the socialist community of states and realistic circles in the West, was at the time a positive improvement of the situation in central Europe.

This agreement created conditions for West Berlin to be relieved of the role, imposed upon it in the years of cold war, of a center of harassment, a hotbed of conflict and a bridgehead of political and economic diversion and subversive propaganda and to become a city of peace and cooperation.

The materialization of these conditions, which can only be very useful for all parties involved, of course, depends on the way all provisions of the agreement which mirror the recognition of the political-territorial realities on German soil are observed. Among them the statement that West Berlin is no constituent part of the FRG and cannot be governed by it is of special importance, because it is this very provision, self-evident in principle and fully in accordance with international law, which was and -- what is worse -- still is made the target of political attacks by those forces who want to aggravate the situation in central Europe, undermine peaceful cooperation in this region and misuse West Berlin for this.

The latest example of this is U.S. President Reagan's planned visit to this city. If we can believe West German and West Berlin press reports, the leading FRG representatives intend to accompany the American visitor in their official capacity. If there really is such an intention, it must be stressed that this can only be assessed as a deliberate provocation, because as such a visit will hardly be likely to exert a positive influence on the political situation. Given Reagan's known policy of confrontation, it will become a specific attack against detente, if the leading FRG representatives appear as hosts in West Berlin, thereby violating the Quadripartite Agreement.

It is understandable that the peace forces and realistic politicians in West Berlin anticipate the forthcoming visit with concern. Their viewpoint that West Berlin can fully exploit the possibilities of its peaceful development only if its status which is clearly defined in the Quadripartite Agreement is not violated in any way, meets with understanding and acknowledgement also outside the city. All forces interested in peace, detente and productive international cooperation can only wish that the agreement which has essentially proved good in the past 10 years will continue to have an even more positive effect on international developments.

KOSTANDOV, FRG ECONOMICS MINISTER HOLD TALKS

LDO51258 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 5 Jun 82

[Text] Duesseldorf, 5 Jun (TASS) -- A meeting took place here between L.A. Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and O. Lamsdorff FRG economics minister. Discussions took place on mutual interests concerning questions of economic relations between both countries.

They announced that the next session of the USSR and FRG Commission on Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation will take place in Bonn in October 1982.

EVALUATION OF VISIT OF AUSTRIAN PRESIDENT

Foreign Press Reaction

PMO41341 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 82 p 4

[TASS roundup: "Changing the Situation for the Better"]

[Text] Commenting on the results of the Soviet-Austrian talks in Moscow, foreign countries' mass media, politicians and public figures stress that the practice of peaceful cooperation among states is particularly valuable in the current international climate.

Austrian press, television and radio point out the tribute paid to the current state of relations between the USSR and Austria in the speech delivered by L.I. Brezhnev at a Kremlin dinner in honor of R. Kirchschlaeger, federal president of the Republic of Austria. In the Soviet leader's view, OBEROESTERREICHISCHE NACHRICHTEN writes, Soviet-Austrian cooperation is now a significant factor in the peace of Europe.

The newspaper KURIER points out that L.I. Brezhnev stressed the importance for Austria of the 1955 State Treaty, which is the foundation of its permanent political neutrality. The Soviet leader, the influential DIE PRESSE writes, spoke positively of Austria's permanent neutrality policy which enables Vienna to play an active part in international affairs. He praised Austria's activity in the efforts to consolidate peace and to maintain an East-West dialog. Relations between the two countries are developing on the basis of honesty and sincerity, the newspaper stresses, and this is no diplomatic dictum but a perfectly real factor.

The Austrian press notes with particular satisfaction that during the Soviet-Austrian talks considerable attention was paid to questions relating to expanding and deepening trade and economic ties between the two countries. In this connection VOLKSTIMME cites the remarks made by Austrian President R. Kirchschlaeger in an interview with journalists in Moscow in which he dismissed the "warnings" being sounded across the ocean that developing business contacts could result in Austria becoming "more heavily dependent" on the USSR. I am very pleased, the president said, that there is a possibility of more orders from the Soviet Union. We have been cooperating with the Soviet Union in the economic sphere for 27 years now and there are as yet no signs that this has led to any political dependence.

The newspaper ARBEITER-ZEITUNG notes the optimism with which the Soviet leader spoke of the possibility of settling international disputes and consolidating peace and international detente. In the Soviet leader's statements, the newspaper writes, there is a comment to which particular attention must be paid. As he said, while having a sober awareness of the anxieties currently besetting the world, we are nevertheless not inclined to indulge in pessimism. He takes the view that the present world situation can be changed for the better.

The APA agency points out that L.I. Brezhnev attaches paramount importance to solving the problem of nuclear disarmament, expressing a willingness to negotiate an agreement on limiting and reducing any weapons or weapons systems. The Soviet leader, APA states, also advocated contacts and talks at the highest level.

The supreme importance of the initiatives for consolidating peace and detente which the Soviet Union is taking in the international arena was stressed by F. Muhri, chairman of the Communist Party of Austria. The Soviet Union's constructive proposals are aimed at securing peace and disarmament, he pointed out. The consistent peace policy pursued by the socialist community states, F. Muhri said, contrasts sharply with the policy of exacerbating international tension and military confrontation followed by imperialist circles in the West.

Hungary's NEPSZABADSAG stresses that the USSR is striving to achieve equitable disarmament accords. The Soviet Union has consistently advocated the limitation and eradication of the instruments of nuclear war, NEUES DEUTSCHLAND (GDR) points out.

L.I. Brezhnev reaffirmed Soviet determination to continue its consistent efforts in the interests of achieving a lasting peace. He criticized the arms race policy and the continuing efforts of certain Western circles to achieve military superiority, West Berlin's DIE WAHRHEIT points out.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU (FRG) writes: "The Soviet Union will do its utmost to help the second UN General Assembly special session on disarmament to succeed in deed as well as word. It has consistently advocated the limitation and eradication of the instruments of nuclear war and is willing to negotiate an agreement on limiting and reducing any weapons and weapons systems. This was stated by Soviet leader L.I. Brezhnev at a dinner in the Austrian president's honor."

The Soviet leader is a staunch advocate of contacts and talks, including talks at the highest level, France's LE PARISIEN LIBERE points out. He is once again demonstrating good will, the newspaper writes.

The Soviet Union's unflagging search for realistic ways of improving the international situation and removing the threat of the outbreak of a thermonuclear war can leave no sober-minded state or political leader unmoved, said that distinguished Venezuelan public figure, politician and Congress deputy Jose Vicente Rangel, commenting on L.I. Brezhnev's speech. In the face of the sharp increase in international tension, for which imperialism is to blame, the general public of Venezuela and the other countries of Latin America is declaring its support for the Soviet Union's peace-loving efforts to spare mankind another world war, he pointed out.

Kirchschlaeger Assessment

PM040913 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 82 p 4

[TASS report: "High Assessment"]

[Text] Vienna, 30 May -- President R. Kirchschlaeger of the Republic of Austria has made a high assessment of the results of his official visit to the Soviet Union and the talks which he had with L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and other Soviet leaders. He emphasized in an interview in the Vienna newspaper VOLKSSTIMME that this visit confirmed the good relations that exist between the two countries and broadened the base for their further development. The president pointed out that this concerns not only economic ties and the broadening of cultural exchange but also the entire sphere of relations. The visit showed, R. Kirchschlaeger said, that, despite the sociopolitical boundaries that exist, it is possible to conduct a mutual dialogue and meet with one another while respecting the other side's independence and freedom.

Replying to a question from the newspaper's correspondent, the president especially pointed out that the Soviet leadership is interested in concrete steps to end the arms race and secure disarmament.

Advocating the holding of fruitful talks despite the differences that exist in the evaluation of individual questions, he emphasized in conclusion that the resolution of the urgent problems of our time -- chief among which is peace, and as a consequence of this, disarmament -- can be achieved only by way of talks.

The Austrian press is giving extensive coverage to the results of Austrian President R. Kirchschlaeger's official visit to the Soviet Union. The results of this visit, the newspaper VOLKSSTIMME writes, are a success not only for Austria. An important feature of this visit is the fact that the president voiced his profound conviction that the Soviet Union is interested in arms limitation and disarmament and that it is possible to hold fruitful talks with the USSR. It is now up to the United States, the newspaper emphasizes, to show in practice that the preservation of peace is for it, too, a most important present-day problem whose resolution must not be made dependent on disagreements over other questions.

All the newspapers give a detailed account of the Soviet-Austrian communique, highlighting the concern it expresses over the growth of international tension and the sides' determination to help in every possible way to continue the process begun by the CSCE.

SOBOLEV ON SWEDEN'S HOUNDING 'INNOCENT' SPY

PM041415 Moscow SOVetskaya Rossiya in Russian 27 May 82 p 5

[I. Sobolev commentary: "Continuing Persecution"]

[Text] SOVetskaya Rossiya has already described how Owen Wilkes, a staffer of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI], was accused by the Swedish authorities of "espionage and violation of the military secrets law." The grounds for this decision were provided by the fact that Wilkes had visited the Baltic islands of Oland and Gotland with a group of tourists. He allegedly gathered information of a secret nature.

Without further ado, the Stockholm city court sentenced the scientist to 6 months' imprisonment in January and subsequent deportation from Sweden. Meanwhile, the facts show that the court authorities' decision was based on false accusations. In the words of A. Hansson, head of a section of Televerket [Swedish Telecommunications Administration] which services radio stations, what are involved are installations not related to Swedish defense.

The court authorities' arbitrary decision has caused a sharp protest from the democratic public of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Britain, the FRG and other countries belonging to SIPRI.

The authorities were forced to reexamine the Wilkes case. The same accusations were again levelled against the scientist at a second examination at a higher court. The opinion of court officials did not change even after statements by witnesses who cited convincing evidence of Wilkes' innocence. Contrary to logic, the court upheld the sentence.

Some 2 years ago the scientist was sentenced by the Oslo city court to 6 months' probation and a large fine.

The grounds were provided by a book published jointly with a Norwegian researcher N.P. Gleditsch. The book indicated the existence in Norway of a network of special stations for communication with U.S. espionage satellites which in turn are being used to listen in to television and radio communications on the USSR's territory and conversations between certain diplomatic missions and their states. The book, written on the basis of open press reports, stresses that these stations do not just harm detente but are an element undermining the basis of Norwegian foreign policy.

By all accounts, the Swedish democratic press is concluding that the earlier round of persecution of Owen Wilkes clearly seemed inadequate to the authorities.

ISRAEL'S 'FIFTH WAR' AGAINST ARABS CONDEMNED

LD061442 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 6 Jun 82

["Fresh Bandit Aggression by Israel" -- TASS headline; by TASS commentator Yevgeniy Kisilev]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun (TASS) -- The fire of a new war has been ignited in the Middle East. The Israeli brass hats, with the support and connivance of the United States, have to all intents and purposes unleashed a fifth war against the Arabs. This time the target of their aggressive actions is Lebanon and the Palestinian refugee camps located on Lebanese territory.

Blood and tears are flowing today on the long-suffering soil of Lebanon, the inhabitants of which are being subjected to bombing raids and shelling from land, sea and air. Streams of refugees are fleeing to the north of the country from the southern regions, which are enveloped in the fighting. It is basically a question of genocide against the Arab people of Palestine, of their physical extermination.

The new war against the Arabs has been long in preparation by the Israeli aggressors and has been unleashed gradually. The tragedy of Lebanon is once more confirmed by an evident truth: It is precisely Israel whose aggressive, expansionist policy has turned this country into the bloody wound of the Middle East. Another truth is also evident: Tel Aviv would not have been able to pursue such a brazen and provocative policy of igniting the fire of war in this region of the world had it not been able to rely on the all-round political, military and economic assistance of its "strategic ally" -- the United States.

It is precisely from planes, guns and tanks of American manufacture that American bombs, missiles and shells are raining down on the Lebanese and Palestinians. It is sufficient to say that since 1973 Israel has been supplied with \$12 billion worth of American weapons and that annual U.S. aid has long exceeded \$2 billion. At the end of May, Israeli Defense Minister Ari'el Sharon had talks in Washington on questions of "strategic cooperation" with the United States in an attempt to obtain from the United States more military supplies on the eve of Israel's planned major operation against the Palestinians in Lebanon. And it is absolutely out of the question that Israel's preparation for the fresh aggression remained secret from Sharon's partners in the talks.

Attention should also be drawn to the fact that Israel's aggression against Lebanon started several hours after the UN Security Council call for an immediate and simultaneous cessation of all military activities in Lebanon and in the region of the Lebanese-Israeli border no later than 0600 on Sunday, Lebanese time. A resolution adopted by the council notes with profound alarm the deterioration in the situation in the region and the violation of the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon. In unleashing another war against a neighboring Arab country, Israel has demonstrated for the umpteenth time its disregard of international public opinion. The appeals of the leaders of the U.S. administration for fulfillment of the above-mentioned resolution of the UN Security Council look like sheer hypocrisy. U.S. aid, patronage and support is encountering sharp condemnation throughout the world.

The new act of aggression by Israel most graphically confirms that the road of separate deals has nothing in common with the task of establishing a lasting and just peace in the Middle East. Such deals only encourage the Israeli aggressors to use more force against the Arab states and peoples, and lead to the imperialist forces obtaining a beachhead for direct interference in the affairs of the states of the Middle East and adjacent regions.

How can we end the conflagration of war in the Middle East and the suffering of the victims of the Israeli aggressors? There is only one road here; an all-embracing and just settlement in the Middle East must ensure the return to the Arab countries of all the lands seized from them by Israel, ensure the Arab people of Palestine the realization of their inalienable right to self-determination and the creation of their own state, and permit all states of this region, including Israel, to live in peace and security. The achievement of such a peace is possible only with the aid of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all interested parties.

REPORTAGE ON ISRAELI INVASION OF LEBANON

Israelis Advance Into Lebanon

LD061256 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Beirut, 7 Jun, TASS -- Israeli Armed Forces have started a new aggression on Lebanon and the Arab people of Palestine. Armoured and artillery units are being moved into Lebanon across the border. A call-up of reservists has been announced in Israel itself.

Israeli troops landed at night in the area of the inhabited localities of Dayat al-Arab and Arab-Slim in the central sector of southern Lebanon and entered combat there in an attempt to cut off the main positions of the national-patriotic forces of the country and the Palestinian resistance movement. The land invasion followed a massive bombardment of Lebanese populated localities and Palestinian refugee camps and by artillery bombardment with the participation of naval ships that approached the coast in the area of the towns of Sayda and Tyre. Yesterday the aggressors dropped bombs, including pellet and fragmentary ones, on 38 towns and villages of Lebanon. The total number of casualties among the civilian population, according to data as of the morning of Jun 6, amounted to 220 people killed and not less than 410 injured.

Despite the U.N. Security Council's call to cease fire today by six a.m., local time, bombing sorties by Israeli aircraft continued after the above-mentioned time. Air pirates commit excesses in Lebanese skies, not sparing civilians. Near Beirut, on the road between Khaldah and Doha, an Israeli air pilot fired on a bus killing 20 school-children and wounding 25. Today bombs were released over the Damour area, the coastal inhabited localities of Ar-Rimayla and Qasimaya, the oil-processing plant at Az-Zahrani and the town of An-Nabatiyah. The highway running from Beirut to Sayda and An-Nabatiya as well as ways leading to Beaufort Fortress are being intensively shelled.

As is considered here, air bombardment which has inflicted a tremendous damage upon the civilian population of Lebanon, was carried out as a psychological preparation for an invasion of Lebanon and the delivery of heavy strikes on land and from the sea. With the same end in view, Israel has saturated the separatist Haddad grouping, to which Israel assigns the role of one of its striking forces in Lebanon's south, with weapons and other military equipment.

According to data from Palestinian sources, three Israeli aircraft were shot down yesterday, and another one was shot down in the area of An-Nabatiya today, with the wounded pilot getting into the hands of a Lebanese detachment.

The start of the aggression followed military consultations between Tel Aviv and Washington. Thus, a high-ranking representative of the U.S. military establishment visited Israel recently, and Israeli Defence Minister Sharon, for his part, visited his colleagues in the Pentagon. The talks were conducted within the framework of secret military agreements between Israel and the USA. New deliveries of military equipment, including those for the operation which was being prepared, were promised to the aggressor by the U.S. side. The Americans also replenished Israeli bases with new aircraft.

A question is being asked in local circles, what prompted a trip by the FRG's Foreign Minister Genscher to Israel on the eve of the new aggression. The trip is being linked with the fact that Tel Aviv is trying to set up deliveries of weapons and military equipment from other sources, including NATO countries.

The invasion of Lebanon, it is pointed out here, confirms in all obviousness that deals similar to the Camp David one only encourage the Israeli aggressors to further use of force against Arab states and peoples and enable imperialist forces to gain a spring-board for direct interference in the affairs of local countries. The way of separate deals has nothing in common with the task of establishing a lasting and just peace in the Middle East and is threatening new aggravations of the conflict.

PLO Communique Cited

LD061812 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 6 Jun 82

[Text] Beirut, 6 Jun, TASS -- The strength of Israeli troops which invaded Lebanon in the early hours today stands at approximately 20,000 people, the Palestine Liberation Organisation has said in a communique. The forces of invasion are moving deeper inside the country in three directions.

Israel landed troops from helicopters in a Palestine refugee camp, Bourge al-Shimaly, who went into action against the joint detachments of the Palestinian resistance movement and the national patriotic forces of Lebanon. At the same time Israel landed an amphibious force on the coast near Tyre. According to Palestinian figures, not less than 150 Israeli soldiers were killed in the fighting near Tyre and Ar-Rashidiyah.

Israeli Offensive Repelled

LD070900 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 7 Jun 82

[Text] Beirut, 7 Jun, TASS -- Detachments of Lebanese and Palestinian forces are repelling the offensive of the invading Israeli troops in the area at the mouth of Awwali River north of the town of Sidon. Fierce fighting is being waged on the outskirts of the town of An-Nabatiyah, which the Israeli troops are trying to invade.

Israeli warplanes have already several times flown today over the Lebanese capital. They have resumed bombing the town of Tyre and the nearby Palestinian refugee camp.

According to a spokesman for the U.N. interim peace force, Israeli troops have in some areas crossed up to 60 kilometers deep into Lebanon's territory.

Israel, Syrian Troops Clash

LD071008 Moscow TASS in English 0910 GMT 7 Jun 82

[Text] Damascus, 7 Jun, TASS -- Israeli troops crossed the Lebanese border on Sunday and advanced towards the positions of Syrian troops in Lebanon, according to a spokesman for the Syrian military command. He said in a statement issued today that there were engagements between the Israeli and Syrian troops in the areas of Jarmaq, Barghut and Hasbayya.

The Syrian troops were given the order to repulse the Israeli troops and they were fulfilling their task.

Soviet UN Envoy's Comment

LD070626 Moscow TASS in English 0607 GMT 7 Jun 82

[Text] New York, 7 Jun, TASS -- Israel's undisguised and unprovoked aggression against Lebanon grossly flouts the elementary norms of international law, the principles of the U.N. Charter and the Security Council's resolutions, including Resolution 508 on immediate ceasefire in Lebanon. This was stated by the USSR's permanent representative at the United Nations, Oleg Troyanovskiy, speaking at the Security Council on the question of Israel's aggression against Lebanon. The Security Council, he said, called upon the U.N. members to use all their weight to ensure termination of hostilities in Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli frontier. It is absolutely obvious that the call referred primarily to Israel's "strategic ally" -- the United States. The illusion that the explosive situation in the Middle East will now impel the United States for action prompted by the feeling of responsibility has been dispelled, the Soviet representative said. It is clear that Washington's policy based on all-round and unconditional support of Israel, gives Tel Aviv a green light to all new acts of aggression and expansion, stressed the representative of the USSR.

PONOMAREV RECEIVES IRAQ'S TARIQ 'AZIZ

LD042104 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] There has been a meeting here in Moscow with an Iraq deputy prime minister and a member of the Revolutionary Command Council, Tariq 'Aziz. The Soviet side was represented by candidate member of the Communist Party Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, Boris Ponomarev, and Deputy Prime Minister Ivan Arkhipov. The [word indistinct] of Soviet-Iraqi relations were discussed. Tariq 'Aziz has now left Moscow.

INA Report

JN042020 Baghdad INA in Arabic 2000 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] Baghdad, 4 Jun (INA) -- Tariq 'Aziz, Revolution Command Council member and deputy prime minister, returned here tonight following a 1-day working visit to the Soviet Union.

'Aziz held official talks this afternoon with Boris Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Council of Nationalities. The talks focused on bilateral relations, the current situation in the Arab region and issues of mutual interest. The talks were attended by Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Iraqi ambassador in Moscow.

SOVIET-IRAQI FRIENDSHIP SOCIETY MEETS IN MOSCOW

JN030602 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1920 GMT 2 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jun (INA) -- The fourth conference of the Soviet-Iraqi Friendship Society was held in Moscow today. Mikhail Alekseyevich Prokofyev was re-elected as chairman of the society for the next 4 years. Fourteen members of the society's administrative board were also elected.

The Iraqi ambassador to the USSR delivered a speech praising the great role that friendship societies are assuming in strengthening relations of friendship among the peoples. He said that Iraqi-Soviet relations continue to expand in a manner that satisfies friends and angers foes.

In a speech he delivered, Prokofyev praised the friendship that exists between the USSR and Iraq. He said that this friendship will strengthen cooperation between the two countries in service of the two peoples.

ARKHIPOV, SYRIA'S AL-ASAD MEET IN DAMASCUS

PM041401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 82 p 4

[TASS report: "Agreements Signed"]

[Text] Damascus, 27 May -- I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is heading a Soviet Government delegation, has been received by Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad.

The sides examined questions affecting friendly relations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Syria and expressed profound satisfaction at their development. Note was made of the success of the talks conducted by the Soviet delegation in Damascus.

At the meeting there was a comprehensive discussion of the Near East situation. The Soviet delegation head confirmed the Soviet Union's unfailing support for Syria's struggle against the Israeli and U.S. intrigues aimed against Arab countries. H. al-Asad expressed gratitude to the Soviet Union for its help and firm support for the Arabs' just cause.

The meeting was attended by 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, Syrian deputy prime minister and foreign minister, and V.I. Yukhin, USSR ambassador to Syria.

During the visit a number of agreements were signed which envisage the further development of mutually beneficial cooperation between Syria and the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government delegation left Damascus for home today.

MOSCOW VIEWS IRAN-IRAQ ARMED CONFLICT

Bovin Commentary

LD061800 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 6 Jun 82

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin]

[Text] There are two wars, one between Argentina and Britain and between Iran and Iraq, which project themselves on the UN General Assembly. We hear and read about the first war every day, but the second, for a number of reasons, seems to be a forgotten war, though for its potential consequences it may turn out to be considerably more dangerous than the conflict in the South Atlantic.

Most wars and armed conflicts in the period after World War II were generally connected with the decolonization process; on the one side were forces which fought for the liquidation of colonial empires and, on the other, forces which tried in one shape or another to preserve colonial dependence. With all possible reservations, the war between Britain and Argentina most probably is one of the last wars of this kind.

But the Iran-Iraq conflict is completely different in nature. Its cornerstone is the struggle for political domination, which may be based on religious differences, while in addition there is a territorial dispute. This dispute has a very long history, and if you talk only about the most recent period, we have the 1975 agreement when the matter stood as follows: The shah of Iran promised to stop support for the Iraq Kurds; in its turn, Iraq agreed that the border between Iran and Iraq in the southern sector would follow the Shatt al-Arab River navigation channel, which means that the eastern bank came under Iranian sovereignty. It seems that Baghdad considered that the deal had been forced on it, and when conditions changed, when the situation changed, it decided to use military force to restore justice.

The Iran-Iraq conflict has made the already confused situation in the region even more confused. The more radical Arab regimes, the Syrian and Libyan, which were in the so-called front of refusal with Iraq, in this case sided with Iran, with Algeria joining; while the so-called moderate, conservative Arab states, like Jordan, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states, sided with the radical regime of Baghdad, which even has socialist slogans. The first group apparently wanted to make Iraq a dominating Arab state while the second was frightened by the revolutionary rhetoric of Khomeyni and did not want Iran to consolidate its positions.

Here is an interesting detail. Despite the fierce anti-Israeli campaign in Tehran, Israel, apparently choosing the lesser evil, decided in the given situation to support Iran and very recently Israel Defense Minister Sharon made an official statement to the effect that Tel Aviv has supplied the Iranian Army with military material. True, this is denied in Tehran, but in my view, not very convincingly. The main question now is whether the Iranian troops will cross the border between Iran and Iraq. If that happens the situation will of course become even more volatile and even more unpredictable. Possibilities for a compromise -- which, speaking abstractly, we all wanted -- are of course now minimal. There can be no talk about discussions with the Saddam Husayn regime, Iranian Petroleum Minister Charazi said at the end of May. We have lost thousands of lives, many of our cities have been devastated and destroyed, and because of this we have the right to demand that the Iraqi people overthrow the regime of Saddam Husayn. Well, on such premises there can be no compromise.

The turn of the wheels of fortune in Iran arouses different reactions, but all are worried by the uncertainty as to what will happen in the future. Searches are being made for ways to settle the conflict. Many rumors are being spread there now. For instance, they say that Saudi King Khalid has sent a letter to Jordan's King Husayn, asking him to convince the Iraqi president to leave the political arena in order, so to speak, to clear the way for peace. It is also rumored that the Gulf states have decided to pay a fairly large sum to Iran in compensation for its losses, again in order to make Iran agree to the conclusion of some kind of peace agreement.

On the whole, comrades, there is still a difficult period ahead for all the states in the region to adapt to a new balance of power which is now being established there.

Dispute 'Meaningless'

NC051249 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Recently, some Iranian newspapers, in reference to the Iran-Iraq war, have tried to discredit the Soviet Union's stance on this conflict. For instance, SOBH-E AZADEGAN newspaper has gone so far as to publish a report that apparently the Soviet Union is instigating Iraq to a war with Iran. However, SOBH-E AZADEGAN does not state what the source of this lie is. This newspaper is ashamed to say that it is repeating slanderous fabrications made by U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig some days ago in Chicago.

Washington resorts to such accusations and gumnies to justify U.S. military presence in the Near and Middle East to "defend" vital U.S. interests in the Persian Gulf Area. Haig had stated sarcastically that the resources and reserves of Iraq and Iran have run out as a result of this war. This situation is completely to the benefit of Washington, which is trying to throw Iran and Iraq off the path of diligent struggles against the machinations of imperialism and Zionism in the Near and Middle East.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it should be said that our country's stance on the Iran-Iraq conflict is very clear. Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet leader, pointed out in his speech at the 26th CPSU Central Committee Congress that this war is completely meaningless as far as the interests of Iran and Iraq are concerned, while it is very economical for imperialism. Leonid Brezhnev said that the Soviet Union strongly supports a rapid termination of this fratricide and a settlement of the conflict through political means. We are also trying to help toward this end by action.

SOBHE AZADEGAN as well as other Iranian newspapers, which have adhered to the slanders uttered by Haig, are undoubtedly assisting U.S. imperialism and Zionism in their efforts to use the Iran-Iraq conflict to implement their profit-loving objectives.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH IRAN EXAMINED

'Long-Term Agreements'

NC051945 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 5 Jun 82

[Vladimir Ivanenko talk]

[Excerpts] Dear listeners, 14 years ago the Soviet Union and Iran agreed to form a permanent state committee for economic cooperation assigned to follow up all problems relating to projects implemented with the participation of both countries.

Vladimir Ivanenko, secretary in charge of the Soviet-Iranian cooperation committee, writes on this committee: At present, cooperation is continuing in the implementation of 154 projects, 104 of which have been completed. All of the projects implemented or being implemented through Soviet-Iranian cooperation play an important role in Iran's economic progress, the creation of job possibilities and the training of a national cadre.

Among the industrial and economic units built in Iran with Soviet technical cooperation, not one can be found whose returns are low or unprofitable like some production units built by Western monopolies. All the production units built with the two countries' cooperation belong to the Iranian people and operate to the benefit of the people.

At this point, I should recall the incidents of the past few years. Immediately after Iran's revolution during which the Iranian people said no to U.S. imperialism and overthrew the shah's regime, imperialism's devoted puppet, the imperialist countries declared an economic siege on Iran which was aimed at the people of your country. As a result of this siege, almost all of the industrial units built with the cooperation of stern companies in Iran were closed because their activities had been planned by the Western monopolies in such a way so as to be completely dependent on the import of machinery parts, spares and raw materials from foreign countries. However, almost all the production units built with Soviet technical cooperation in Iran remained in operation. Even the Isfahan steel complex, which is an extremely complicated industrial unit, continued its operations and its output increased. The basic reason for this is that the approach of Soviet organizations to economic cooperation with Iran is completely different to the approach of the Western monopolies. The Soviet organizations prepared the plans for these industrial units in such a way that they would not be dependent on imports.

In all the sessions of the committee, Soviet-Iranian economic and technical cooperation and its expansion on the basis of long-term agreements by respecting the principle of balance and the ensuring of mutual profits were discussed. Ascertaining a vast outlook of cooperation grants Iran the opportunity to program, with the cooperation of Soviet organizations, the progress of important production fields such as power and steel industries, machine-building plants, irrigation, land improvement, housing, the training of a national cadre of experts, transportation and transit.

In conclusion, Vladimir Ivanenko writes: One can, therefore, dare say that the activities of the permanent committee on Soviet-Iranian economic cooperation help strengthen economic and good-neighborly relations between the two countries and the peoples of the Soviet Union and Iran.

Isfahan Steel Mill

NC031247 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Text] The Isfahan steel mill, built with Soviet assistance, is operating successfully. Iranian press reports state that during the past month the quantity of steel produced in the Isfahan steel mill, which is the first unit in Iran's national steel-producing industries, surpassed 58,000 tons. This is the highest figure obtained since the mill began to operate in 1973. At that time 19,000 tons of steel was produced a month.

During the recent meeting of the mixed Soviet-Iranian committee on economic affairs, it was decided to increase the output of the mill from 550,000 tons to 1.9 million tons per year.

LATE REPORT: TASS STATEMENT ON ISRAELI 'AGGRESSION'

LD071636 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 7 Jun 82

["TASS Statement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Jun, TASS -- Following a barbaric bombing of Beirut and other Lebanese cities, Israeli troops, backed by a great number of tanks and by artillery, have intruded into Lebanon. Israeli troops landed simultaneously from the sea. The aggressor is penetrating inside Lebanese territory, bringing death and suffering to peaceful inhabitants -- the Lebanese, and Palestinian refugees.

Challenging the United Nations Organisation, the Israeli troops passed through the regions of the deployment of the U.N. forces dispatched there at the Security Council decision after Israel's aggression in 1978.

Facts show that the Israeli leadership has launched a large-scale and massive aggression against neighbouring Lebanon, is trying to drown in blood the Palestine resistance movement and remove altogether from the agenda the question of the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. At the same time, Tel Aviv would like to intimidate by such bandit actions the Palestinian Arabs on the Western bank of the River Jordan and in the Gaza Strip who are struggling steadfastly against the Israeli occupation for their freedom and independence.

The new Israeli aggression was undoubtedly undertaken with consent and support from Washington which armed Israel to the teeth and is pushing it by its policy to carry out criminal anti-Arab actions. The attack on Lebanon is a direct consequence of the Camp David deal and American-Israeli "strategic cooperation." The entire world sees today even clearer what fruits are borne by the collusion between Washington and Tel Aviv.

TASS is authorized to declare that the Soviet Union emphatically condemns Israel's aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. To try to impose on the Arabs its diktat, to compel them to renounce their legitimate rights and subordinate themselves to the military-strategic plans of imperialism in the Middle East is an adventure which may cost much [for] Israel itself and its people.

The Soviet Union demands an immediate cessation of Israel's armed invasion of Lebanon and a pull-out of the Israeli troops to their territory. The U.N. Security Council, which bears chief responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should immediately take measures to curb the aggression, to compel Israel to respect the Charter and decisions of the United Nations, to guard the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab peoples.

Israel's aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian people is once again taking the Middle East to a dangerous line. To prevent a new military explosion there, which threatens universal peace, to reverse the developments in the Middle East towards a search for a comprehensive and just solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict is the top priority duty of all countries and peoples who hold dear the cause of peace and justice.

REPORT ON VISIT OF ANGOLAN DELEGATION

PM041217 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 82 Morning Edition p 5

["On the Visit to the Soviet Union by a Delegation of the Angolan People's Assembly" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A delegation of the Angolan People's Assembly headed by M. Bernado de Sousa, member of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola [MPLA] -- Party of Labor Central Committee and first secretary of the People's Assembly, paid an official visit to the Soviet Union 11 - 12 May at the USSR Supreme Soviet's invitation.

The delegation was received by V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Meetings and conversations were held with the chairmen of the chambers and with the chairmen and members of the permanent commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers.

The Angolan People's Assembly delegation visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, where it laid wreaths.

In addition to Moscow, our Angolan guests visited Leningrad and the Ukrainian and Uzbek SSR's, where they called at industrial and agricultural enterprises and toured historical and cultural sites. The delegation was given a warm and friendly reception wherever it went.

In the course of the talks and conversations held both in Moscow and while touring the country, the Angolan parliamentarians were acquainted with the structure and activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers and permanent commissions and of republic and local soviets, and with the USSR Supreme Soviet's international ties, the Soviet people's achievements in implementing the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and the historic experience of implementing Lenin's nationalities policy in the 60 years since the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

For their part our Angolan comrades spoke about the activities of the Angolan People's Assembly and provincial assemblies and about the efforts being made by the MPLA-Party of Labor, the Angolan Government and the entire Angolan people to restore and strengthen the economy and solve the political, social, economic and cultural tasks outlined by the First Extraordinary MPLA-Party of Labor Congress.

The visitors remarked that study of the Soviet Union's experience of creating and organizing the work of people's power organs is of great importance to the People's Republic of Angola.

During a discussion of international issues, the Soviet and Angolan parliamentarians voiced concern at the recent serious deterioration in the international climate, responsibility for which lies with the aggressive imperialist circles headed by the United States.

The Angolan delegation spoke highly of the USSR's contribution to the cause of maintaining peace and detente, strengthening international security and halting the arms race, and of the unfailing support given by the Soviet Union to the peoples' struggle for their national liberation and the consolidation of independence. The delegation declared Angola's full approval of the Soviet peace initiatives advanced at the 26th CPSU Congress and in the period since then. It stressed that the new Soviet proposals formulated by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev in his speeches at the 17th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions, the Tashkent ceremony and the 19th Komsomol Congress aimed at improving the international situation are in complete conformity with the interests of all peace-loving forces.

The Soviet parliamentarians spoke highly of Angola's foreign policy, its role in the Organization of African Unity and the Nonaligned Movement and its principled stance in support of the national liberation movement in southern Africa, and they reaffirmed their immutable solidarity with the Angolan people.

Our Angolan comrades spoke about the situation which has developed on Angola's border with Namibia as a result of incessant acts of aggression against Angola by the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa.

The Soviet and Angolan parliamentarians voiced concern at the increase in tension in southern Africa caused by the continued acts of aggression carried out against Angola by the Republic of South Africa with the connivance and open support of the imperialist powers. The parliamentarians called for the immediate liberation of Angolan territory from the South African interventionists and the prompt and unconditional implementation of UN decisions on a just settlement in Namibia, and they condemned the maneuvers aimed at perverting the spirit of UN Security Council Resolution No 435 on this issue.

Regarding bilateral ties, it was said that Soviet-Angolan relations are successfully developing in complete conformity with the spirit of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and Angola in the interests and to the benefit of the people of both countries. Satisfaction was also voiced at the establishment of firm contacts between the supreme organs of state power in the Soviet Union and Angola. Stress was once again laid on the urgency and importance of the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal of 23 June 1981 to the parliaments and peoples of the world and on the accord reached on more closely coordinating the activities of both countries' parliaments in the world arena.

The Angolan People's Assembly delegation expressed deep appreciation to the USSR Supreme Soviet for the warm welcome and hospitality given it during its stay.

PRAVDA: S. AFRICA STEPS UP AGGRESSION IN ANGOLA

LD070850 Moscow TASS in English 0637 GMT 7 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 7 Jun, TASS -- "The South African brass have stepped up again their armed provocations against the People's Republic of Angola," Valeriy Volkov writes in PRAVDA. "The South African Air Force launches massive bombing raids against populated localities in the country's south. Mobile units of South African troops, the so-called 'death columns', carry out punitive operations against the peaceful population of the Angolan province of Cunene. As a result of these barbarous actions, civilians have been killed and considerable material damage has been done to the emergent state's national economy."

This sabre-rattling is designed, the commentary says, to make the independent African countries display "tractability" at a moment when Western countries are drafting new proposals for a Namibian settlement.

"By using, on one hand, the force of arms and, on the other, backstage diplomatic manoeuvres, South African authorities and the United States, Britain, West Germany, France and Canada, which make the so-called 'contact group,' are trying at all cost to place a puppet regime in power in Namibia, preventing SWAPO from taking part in decision-making on the country's destinies," Valeriy Volkov writes.

"The provocative actions of racist-ruled South Africa and its Western patrons, in the opinion of observers, complicate the process of stabilising the situation in southern Africa and jeopardise peace and security," the commentator emphasises. "The real way of lessening tension in that region lies in the termination of the armed provocations against the independent African countries, the convocation of an international conference on Namibia, and the strict observance of the United Nations Security Council resolutions towards holding truly democratic elections in that country under international control."

MOSCOW NOTES ATTEMPTS TO RELIEVE CHILE'S WOES

Civil Disobedience Manual

PY061105 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2000 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Chilean journalist Jose Miguel Varas commentary]

[Text] We have received a document, from Chile which according to our source, has recently begun to circulate there. As its title notes, this document is a group of general ideas about how to overthrow Pinochet.

This document is quite different in style and content from the usual political party statements. Instead of making an extensive review of the situation, it begins by summarizing basic principles, the basic objective being: The people must seek the proper tools to overthrow Pinochet. The people are united by the desire to achieve freedom, democracy, justice, work and a dignified life. To achieve these objectives Pinochet must be overthrown. The struggle unites the people. The first tool of this struggle is the unity of all Chileans in the struggle against tyranny.

But many Chileans ask themselves how to carry out this struggle. This document, which was edited in Chile, answers this question by noting: To carry out the struggle against Pinochet, the people cannot rely on financial resources or on the media since the people cannot express their opinion freely.

After mentioning this demoralizing situation, the document which was brought to us from Chile notes that the people can rely on their intelligence, their initiative, creativity, audacity and their hope for freedom to seek a thousand ways to make life impossible for the tyranny. Despite the threats issued by the mongrel [interior minister] Montero, and the repressive campaigns launched by the government, there are initiatives for the struggle among the people and all those who suffer oppression -- men, women, children, civilians and military alike -- must participate in it.

By using popular language, the document also provides details on a group of ideas or initiatives that make up a civil disobedience campaign against hunger and unemployment, the main objective being to overthrow Pinochet. The document states, and I quote: Do not pay your debts; do not pay your mortgages. So that your property is not seized, hide your valuables; if your television set is confiscated, buy another one on credit. Remember that Pinochet promised a television set for every Chilean. But do not do it alone. Through a union agreement do not pay debts, since this is why your salary was decreased; at least try to get union support since at any rate Chilean wheat, meat and other products are worthless. [sentence as heard] Do not pay school tuition in private or public schools: Demand free compulsory education. Do not pay you electricity or water bills. Demand free medical attention in hospitals, milk for your children and medicine. Delay your tax payments, defer all your payments since the new taxes are to cover for the Crav [Vina del Mar sugar refining company] and the bonuses for bankrupt financial firms and banks which take their capital abroad after the great spree. Demand work and food at the CEMA [mothers centers] offices, at the municipalities and police precinct buildings. Demand government financing to open new job sources, to reduce your debts, to reactivate industries and agriculture. The list is long since there are many ways to protest. The basic characteristics of those protest means are that they are at the disposal of all and once they are implemented they will help ease the terrible economic situation the majority of Chileans are faced with. Moreover, in view of their nature, these are actions that do not pose any risk to those who carry them out. This is nothing to scoff at in a country that has been subjected for many years to a repressive regime.

In another chapter, this true manual of civil disobedience against the dictatorship urges all people to carry out the second ironathon [planchaton] which consists of a large number of people simultaneously plugging in their irons and all kinds of electric appliances so that the excess voltage will blow up the electric power substations.

The idea of the ironathon came up last year and it was quite successful on several occasions. This year all Chileans are urged to plug in their irons and electric appliances for 1 hour between 2030 and 2130 every Friday during the months of June, July and August.

The document ends with clear and precise words: The sooner you join this campaign to overthrow Pinochet, the less our children will suffer; the longer the time, the more the hatred; and at a given time this hatred may be fatal for our fatherland. We must overthrow Pinochet before this happens. We place great hope in your actions. Many hundreds of thousands will be doing the same thing with you.

This combat manual for civil disobedience is signed by the Chilean Democratic Recovery Movement.

New Leftist Bloc

PY050831 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2000 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Text] A declaration has been released in Chile announcing the formation of a new political bloc named Socialist Unity [Convergencia Socialista] composed of the United Popular Action Movement, MAPU; the workers and peasants United Popular Action Movement; the Christian left; and a sector of the 24th Congress Socialist Party with the participation of Carlos Altamirano, (Erex Nafit) and other leaders.

The declaration describes the current situation of the country as the most serious crisis in Chilean history and makes the government economic team, above all, responsible for the economic policies implemented in the nation.

It then mentions the climate of insecurity and defenselessness in which the Chileans live in the face of the regime's arbitrariness and crimes and the general political crisis the country is experiencing. In this regard, the declaration says that it is obvious after almost 9 years that our own weaknesses are responsible for the lack of alternatives, the lack of solid forces and the lack of new horizons for the nation. This situation will permit the existence for many more years of an incapable government, thus deepening the crisis and dragging the country into decadence and weakness as a nation.

After affirming that the country is tired of dogmatism, intolerance, narrow [word indistinct], heavyhandedness and totalitarianism, the document proposes the renewal of political parties, social and economic measures to restrain consumerism and encourage savings. Defining its objectives, the declaration of the new socialist convergence bloc states: We recognize that our parties, acting separately, have failed to respond to the nation's challenges; we need unity but unity that is not the mere joining together of our organic forces. Far from this, we intend to try to interpret the sentiments of thousands of our fellow countrymen who pin their aspirations on libertarian socialism.

The declaration is dated Santiago 1 May 1982 and is signed by the secretariat of the socialist convergence which, as we noted at the beginning of this commentary, is made up of the MAPU party, workers and peasants MAPU, Christian left and a sector of the Socialist Party (24th Congress).

S. AMERICANS' REFUSAL ON U.S. MANEUVERS NOTED

LD040958 Moscow TASS in English 0943 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] Washington, 4 Jun, TASS -- Three Latin American countries, Brazil, Ecuador and Venezuela, rejected a United States' proposal to take part in naval exercises to be held in the South Atlantic before long. ASSOCIATED PRESS emphasises that the refusal has been the reply by the Latin American countries to Washington's support for Britain in its colonialist policy on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

KISELEV, ROMANOV DISCUSS AGRICULTURE AT PLENUMS

LD041734 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] The results of the CPSU Central Committee's May plenum and the tasks emerging from Comrade Brezhnev's report were discussed today at the plenums of the Leningradskaya Obkom and the Communist Party of Belorussian Central Committee.

Comrade Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Leningradskaya Obkom, gave a report in Leningrad. The report and speeches placed significance on the questions of increasing the production of machines and machinery for the countryside, raising the efficiency of scientific and planning organizations, and the training of cadres for agriculture.

At the plenum of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee in Minsk, Comrade Kiselev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee, gave a report. It was noted that in the (three decades) of the development of agriculture in the republic, R16 billion had been invested, that is five and a half times more than in all preceding years of Soviet rule. The growing role of primary rural party organizations in the implementation of the plans was stressed.

SHEVARDNADZE ATTENDS GEORGIAN MEETING

LD042142 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Summary] To help party organizations mobilise work collectives to implement the food program is the task which was posed to Georgia's lecturers by the congress of the republic's Znaniye Society.

"Comrade Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the work of the congress."

PRAVDA ON GEORGIAN PARTY COMMISSION'S WORK

PM041535 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 31 May publishes on page 2 under the rubric "leadership style and methods" a 1,800-word article by Sh. Karkarashvili, chairman of the Georgian CP Central Committee Party Commission, entitled "scale of influence." The article is prefaced with the following introduction: "The Georgian CP Central Committee Party Commission, which is called upon to be the Central Committee's active assistant, examines dozens of matters every year. It cannot and does not have the right to stand aloof from the consistent and resolute struggle which the party organization is waging for the purity of its ranks and to strengthen party and state discipline in every possible way by implementing the CPSU Central Committee resolutions on Tbilisi Gorkom." The article then proceeds to examine certain aspects of the Party Commission's work, pointing out that it endeavors to ensure the enhanced discipline and responsibility of cadres, strict observance of the CPSU rules and the struggle against deviations from the norms of party life.

SHCHERBITSKIY APPEARS IN TV FILM ON KIEV

OW060012 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 0345 GMT on 29 May carries a 1-hour video film entitled "City of Science" devoted to the 1,500th anniversary of Kiev. The film is presented in five segments and includes a brief address by Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at a 15 April 1982 meeting of the Ukrainian SSR party aktiv.

The first segment, "The Echo of Ancient Wisdom Is Here," shows views of Kiev and a model of the city in ancient times as Academician Boris Aleksandrovich Rybakov discusses the Nestor Chronicles, which prove that Kiev was founded 1,500 years ago. The second segment, "From Nestor to Our Day," begins with a brief shot of the presidium of the 14 April joint session of the Academies of Sciences of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR.

USSR Academy of Sciences President Anatoliy Petrovich Aleksandrov is seen at the microphone with Shcherbitskiy sitting to this right. The camera cuts to a close shot of Shcherbitskiy with Academician Boris Yevgenyevich Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, on his right and then cuts to another group of people in the presidium which includes Aleksey Fedoseyevich Vatchenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Ukraine Communist Party Politburo. This is followed by brief shots of another group of people in the presidium and long shots of the audience and presidium.

The film goes on to show Aleksandrov touring a number of heavy industry enterprises in the Ukraine. This portion features the scientific achievements made in production. Aleksandrov is then interviewed in a rural setting and comments primarily on the potential advantages of powder metallurgy. Video then abruptly cuts to a shot of a meeting with a caption identifying it as the 15 April meeting of the Ukrainian SSR party aktiv in Kiev. As the narrator says "The question of introducing scientific developments into practice in the Ukraine is under special party control" the camera cuts to a close shot of Shcherbitskiy standing at the microphone addressing the party aktiv meeting.

Shcherbitskiy says: "Of course we cannot hope that acceleration of scientific and technical progress will occur of its own accord, comrades. We must struggle for this, we must grasp this with both hands, as we sometimes say. Besides, we must all grasp this, economic planners, scientists, production workers and rationalizers alike. Most importantly, comrades -- and you will probably agree with this -- we need to renounce complacency and wage a struggle, I stressed a struggle, everywhere and at all times for scientific and technical progress, keeping in mind the Leninist tenet that the economy is the decisive field of battle for communism. We must more fully utilize the available opportunities, those which we have now.

"As you know much is still unavailable; we must use everything we have, all opportunities and all resources. Each of us should act more fearlessly and with more initiative and each should always remember his responsibility for the entrusted task. We should implement the economic and scientific and technical policies determined by the 26th party congress with practical deeds."

As Shcherbitskiy speaks the camera shows Vatchenko and Aleksandrov sitting behind him, pans the audience and returns for closeup shots of Shcherbitskiy. The narrator then says: "Leaders of scientific research institutes, production associations and plants were in the hall, those who today and tomorrow must solve the tasks posed by life. And the main link in solving this question must become the interaction of science and practice."

The film continues with the third segment, "Interaction," which introduces a number of institutes under the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences where various scientific achievements relating to industrial developments are shown. Among the institutes visited are the Institute of Superhard Materials, the Nuclear Research Institute where the reactor hall of the world's only universal isochronous cyclotron is shown, the Institute of Molecular Biology and Genetics, the Glushkov Institute of Cybernetics, the Institute of Mechanics where fiber optics are shown and the Institute of Technical Thermophysics.

During the fourth segment, "Paton -- son of Paton," the Paton Electrowelding Institute is introduced and the segment is narrated by Boris Yevgenyevich Paton, the son of the institute's founder. He discusses at length methods of electrical welding and the development of welding machines for large - diameter gas pipeline seams.

The fifth and final segment, "My Beloved City," shows more of the film's participants talking of their love for Kiev with shots of the city concluding the program.

TIKHONOV AT FARM MACHINE EXHIBITION

LD031840 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1550 GMT 3 Jun 82

[Text] Comrade Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Gorbachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Comrade Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today visited an exhibition of tractor and agricultural machine-building at the Nitraktorselkhoz mash experimental works located in the Moskovskaya Oblast town of Ivanteyevka. On display are exhibits of new high-capacity, power-saturated tractors and grain combine harvesters. There is a wide representation of machines for fulfilling combined technological operations, for soil protection systems of land husbandry, chainless wide-span machines, seed drills for accurate sowing, highly productive machines for the even application of fertilisers and for the application of industrial technologies into agricultural production.

Comrades Tikhonov, Gorbachev and Dolgikh visited the Nitraktorselkhoz mash works where they became acquainted with new technological equipment earmarked for enterprises of the industry. In conversation with leaders and engineering technological workers, a great deal of attention was given to the fulfillment of instructions of Comrade Brezhnev and the tasks for the implementation of the Food Program adopted by the May plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. It was noted that it is necessary to accelerate resolving questions linked to the lowering of the material capacity of machines, the raising of their quality and reliability, and the use of up-to-date materials, assemblies and component parts and the latest technology in agricultural machine-building.

SOLOMENTSEV PRESENTS AWARD TO SCIENTISTS

LD051330 Moscow TASS in English 1326 GMT 5 Jun 82

[Text] Novosibirsk, 5 Jun, TASS -- The creation of a powerful scientific potential in the east of the USSR a quarter of a century ago became a striking example of the socialist society's tremendous possibilities in solving large-scale tasks.

The Order of Lenin was presented at a meeting here today to the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Addressing the meeting, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Mikhail Solomentsev conveyed to the entire collection of the branch heartfelt congratulations upon the high award of the motherland and wishes of new creative accomplishments from the political bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Leonid Brezhnev.

Noting the big accomplishments of the Siberian Branch, Leonid Brezhnev stressed that these successes were a result of bold scientific quest and discoveries, of selfless work. He expressed confidence that the contribution by Siberian scientists to the development of national science, to the solution of the tasks set by the 26th Congress of the Communist Party would continue growing steadily.

Drawing special attention to the importance of the active participation of Siberia's scientific establishments in the fulfillment of the USSR's Food Programme, Leonid Brezhnev wished the Siberian scientists successful and fruitful work in this nation-wide endeavour.

Assessing the accomplishments of science in Siberia Mikhail Solomentsev said:

"The efforts of your collective have resulted in major scientific developments and outstanding results in the theoretical and applied sections of mathematics and mechanics, nuclear physics and physics of semiconductors, quantum electronics, the theory and practice of catalysis, in the study of processes of burning and explosion, in works in the field of genetics and selection. They are being applied with great usefulness in mining and machine-building, in agriculture, in the development of transport and communications. The USSR has risen to first place in the world in the output of oil and has achieved high indicators in the extraction of gas and reflected in this, no doubt, are the success of the Siberian scientists, of their definitive studies in the field of earth sciences."

The big role of the Siberian Branch in the development of Soviet science was noted by Guriy Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and by the President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Anatoliy Aleksandrov.

"We are all full of joy and pride, of gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet Government, to Leonid Brezhnev for the tremendous attention and concern for the establishment and development of Siberian science," Vice President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Chairman of the Siberian Branch Valentin Koptiyug stressed in his speech.

EDUCATIONAL OFFICIAL ON LANGUAGE TEACHING

LD051126 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Interview with Professor (Baranikov) of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, by unidentified interviewer; place and date of the interview not given -- read by announcer]

[Text] [Question] How does the fact that this country is populated by numerous ethnic groups affect the educational system?

[Answer] In the Soviet Union people speak some 130 languages and dialects. This is a serious problem for educational workers, but we have gained sufficient experience in the field in the past several decades. It is the constitutional right of every Soviet citizen to use his mother tongue. At schools children can be taught in their native language, classes are conducted and schoolbooks published in scores of languages. Each of the 15 sovereign republics composing the Soviet Union has colleges training teachers for non-Russian schools. We guarantee full secondary education to all young people, irrespective of their nationality. This is the educational minimum in the Soviet Union. All stages of education are free. The government covers all the spending.

[Question] To provide the ethnically heterogeneous population with schools and local languages, the government must have had to work hard.

[Answer] Yes, it was difficult to organize the present system of education. Few listeners know that before the socialist revolution of 1917 many ethnic groups in this country did not have a written language, to say nothing of schools. Take for example my native land Buryatia in eastern Siberia. At the beginning of the century, most of the population there could neither read nor write. The intensive development of education started in Buryatia, like elsewhere in the country, only after the socialist revolution. The Buryat written language appeared. In those days the Soviet state was poor. Nevertheless, the government financed the construction of schools, training of teachers and writing of textbooks. Russian scholars and teachers helped us. Later, Buryatia and other non-Russian areas started training their own specialists. As far as I am concerned, I graduated from the teachers training college in the Buryat capital, Uld-Ude. It was the first college in Buryatia. It was not easy to advance schooling in Central Asia and the extreme north, where the population had been almost totally illiterate before the revolution. At the beginning of the century only 2 or 3 out of every 100 Uzbeks, Tadzhiks and Turkmens could read and write. The minority groups in the extreme north did not have written languages.

As in the case of Buryat, Russian linguists developed written languages for them in the 1920s.

[Question] The population in most parts of the USSR is mixed. Who chooses the language in which a child will study?

[Answer] Only the parents, the family and the pupils themselves can decide. Let me speak of Buryatia again, in that autonomous republic there are schools or classes where teaching is conducted in Buryat, and others in which teaching is conducted in Russian. A child can study in either school. In Uzbekistan classes are conducted in seven languages. In the small but ethnically mixed republic of Dagestan in the Caucasian mountains there are schools in five different languages, but in all non-Russian schools the Russian language is a compulsory subject, and in Russian schools the language of the local ethnic group.

[Question] This brings us to the question of the Russian language. The media in the West claim that the non-Russian population in the USSR is being assimilated. What can you say on that?

[Answer] Only people who either do not know the Soviet Union or intentionally twist the facts can say such things. How can one speak of assimilation if only under socialism and as a result of the nationalities policy pursued by the Communist Party, many ethnic groups in this country got the opportunity to develop their language and culture for the first time in history? At the beginning of the century Turkmens, Kirgiz, Buryats, Chuvashes -- I could name scores of other ethnic groups -- had only oral folklore, tales and songs. Now they have professional art workers, their own poets, prose writers, playwrights and filmmakers. Today, Soviet culture is unthinkable without the prose of Kirgizia, the poetry and fine arts of the people in the Caucasus, without the dramatic works of the Baltic nations and so on. Books, papers and magazines are published. Radio and television programs are broadcast, films shot and plays staged in scores of languages. It is another thing that people of various ethnic groups in this country study Russian and want to know it well. They work side by side, move from one place to another and need a language to communicate in. The Russian language performs this function. The giant Baykal-Amur railway stretches from Siberia to the Pacific coast, crossing Buryatia. This project has collected people from many republics and representatives of various ethnic groups. New towns and industrial enterprises grow up along the line, builders settle in the new towns and often get married to people of other nationalities. In general, there are many mixed families in this country. In a great number of cases members of such families speak Russian among themselves. Thanks to translations into Russian, the numerous ethnic groups of this country can get acquainted with each other's literature. Besides, Russian is one of the leading languages in the world. It is the language of many outstanding writers and scientists, and to learn it means to enrich your spiritual life.

[Question] What problems stemming from multilinguality face Soviet schools now?

[Answer] The population in different parts of the nation is becoming ever more mixed. It grows. We need more schools in different languages and more teachers. We now aim at increasing the number of teachers of languages. All teachers training colleges have increased enrollment in departments of language teachers. The development of science, technology and culture calls for renewing curricula. We are also working on new textbooks.

4-6 JUN AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS REPORTED

LD050114/LD070108 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 4-6 June. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

4 June

Mass sowing of spring crops is now in progress in East Siberia and the Far East. In the remaining areas of the country this work has been basically completed. Altogether, according to the latest official data, spring crops have been sown on over 136 million hectares. Irrigated tracts in the country now occupy approximately 18 million hectares; these yield a guaranteed harvest which is 4-6 times bigger than on nonirrigated lands. The Food Program envisages that irrigated lands should be increased 23-24 million hectares by the year 1990. All of Kazakhstan's 2,500 kolkhozes and sovkhozes have completed sowing spring crops. There are already over 2 million hectares of regularly irrigated land in Kazakhstan. They produce 25 percent of all gross agricultural output. In the 11th 5-Year Plan period another 10,000 hectares will be irrigated. Soya is already being cultivated on many farms, with quite good yields being obtained. Soya-growing sovkhozes will be organized here in the very near future. This year the digging of a 150 km long Bolshoy Alma-Atinskiy canal has started to solve the water problem in Alma-Atinskaya Oblast. (1100 GMT)

Harvesting of grain has begun in the Alazani valley of Georgia. A yield of 41 quintals of barley was obtained today. This was 16 quintals more than the plan. Georgian farmers have promised to obtain no less than 30 quintals of grain from each hectare; this is 5 quintals more than the plan. A large irrigation project has been handed over in west Turkmenia. Over 3,000 hectares of virgin land in the Karakum Canal zone has been developed since the beginning of the year. In addition 16,000 square meters of housing has been built. By 1990 a total of 180,000-190,000 hectares of irrigated land are to be handed over in the republic. (1400 GMT)

5 June

One of the most pressing tasks facing the Siberian department of the USSR Academy of Sciences is the implementation of the Food Program. Siberia can become a major reserve in solving the food supply problem of the whole country. Much has to be done to achieve this but one task stands out from the rest, and is being tackled at this moment. On 27 million hectares which are being sown with grain crops in West Siberia, East Siberia and the Far East, mineral fertilizers are not being used to the fullest extent. At the moment through the joint efforts of geologists of the Siberian department of the Academy of Sciences, and the Geology Ministry, major deposits of phosphate and potash minerals have been discovered and are being exploited. Our task entails the commissioning of these deposits for full use by the start of the 12th 5-Year Plan, and the creation of fertilizer manufacturing enterprises in Siberia. (1500 GMT)

In Kustanayskaya Oblast, 10,000 combines are ready for harvesting; 70,000 combines are ready for harvesting in Kazakhstan. In Azerbaijan, 100,000 tons of fresh vegetables have been sent to industrial centers and processing enterprises. (1800 GMT)

6 June

Nearly 20,000 hectares have been newly irrigated during the current 5-year plan in Kirgizia, and 100,000 hectares of mountainous grazing land have been drained. By 1990 the irrigated areas in the USSR should reach 23-25 million hectares, and the drained areas 18-19 million hectares. (0200 GMT)

Preparation for the harvest is being completed in the Ukraine. The overhaul of harvesting equipment is being completed in the Crimea and Kherson Oblasts. A month of shock work for preparation of livestock fodder has begun in Lipetskaya Oblast. The green harvest has begun in Kostromskaya Oblast. A second cutting of alfalfa has begun in Uzbekistan. In Surkhandarinskaya Oblast, where the season has not been favourable, more than 10,000 tons of hay have already been harvested, which is considerably more than last year. (0400 GMT)

COSMOS-1375 EARTH SATELLITE LAUNCHED 6 JUN

LD070914 Moscow TASS in English 0907 GMT 7 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow, 7 Jun, TASS -- The artificial earth satellite Cosmos-1375 was launched in the Soviet Union on Sunday to continue the programme of exploration of outer space.

The initial period of revolution of the sputnik is 105 minutes, the maximum distance from the surface of the earth--021 kilometres, the minimum distance -- 900 kilometres, the inclination of the orbit is 65.9 degrees. The equipment is functioning normally.

PROGRESS-13 UNDOCKS FROM ORBITAL COMPLEX

LD041144 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 4 Jun 82

[Text] Mission Control Center, 4 Jun, TASS -- The program of joint flight completed, the automatic transport spaceship Progress-13 separated from the Salyut-7--Soyuz T-5 orbital complex at 10.31 Moscow time today. The process of undocking and the departure of the spaceship was controlled by specialists from the mission control center and Cosmonauts Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev.

During the joint flight all private operations were carried through in full. They included the unloading of the transport spacecraft, refueling of the integrated propulsion system and the pumping of water into storage tanks aboard the station. Two adjustments of the trajectory of the orbital research complex were made with the help of the power unit of Progress-13.

Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev are in their fourth week aboard Salyut-7. The schedule for today includes the appraisal of parameters of microclimate inside the complex, biological research experiments, a check of the equipment devised for monitoring characteristics of the ionosphere and atmosphere of the earth, including the atmosphere around the complex.

According to results of a comprehensive medical check-up, the state of health of Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev is good. Mission control personnel note with satisfaction that the crew has high capacity for work.